

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 25

Date: July 1, 2009

Subject: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Triennial Performance Audits

Recommendation:* Approve the TDA Triennial Performance Audits for Fiscal Years 2005/2006 through 2007/2008 for the following transit agencies: Omnitrans, Victor Valley Transit Authority, Mountain Area Transit Authority, Morongo Basin Transit Authority and the Cities of Barstow and Needles.

Background: California Public Utilities code, Section 99246(a) requires that SANBAG, acting as the county transportation commission, designate an entity other than itself, to make a performance audit every three years of the activities of each transit operator to whom it allocates funds. The performance audit was conducted by Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC).

Attached are the executive summaries for each Operator's audit which includes a review of the Operator's compliance with TDA requirements, status of prior audit recommendations, transit systems performance trends and a detailed functional review. Overall, all the audits were positive and the operators have taken positive steps over the audit period to improve their operations.

Financial Impact: This item is consistent with the adopted budget. The performance audit is funded through LTF Administrative funds under Task 50209000.

*Approved
Board of Directors*

Date: _____

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

BRD0907c-bk
50210000
Attachment:
BRD0907c1-bk

Board Agenda Item
July 1, 2009
Page 2

Reviewed By: This item was reviewed by the Plans and Programs Committee on June 17, 2009 and unanimously recommended for approval.

Responsible Staff: Mike Bair, Interim Director of Transit and Rail
Beth Kranda, Transit Analyst

BRD0907c-bk
50210000
Attachment:
BRD0907c1-bk



**FY 2006-2008
Triennial Performance Audit
of Omnitrans**

**Submitted to San Bernardino
Associated Governments**

May 2009



Booz | Allen | Hamilton

Executive Summary

The San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) engaged the PMC consultant team to conduct the Transportation Development Act (TDA) triennial performance audit of the six public transit operators under its jurisdiction. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue. This performance audit is conducted for Omnitrans covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2005-06 through 2007-08.

The audit includes a review of the following areas:

- Compliance with TDA Requirements
- Status of Prior Audit Recommendations
- System Performance Trends
- Functional Review

As an additional review measure, a comparison of Omnitrans against similar transit operators around the nation was conducted using transit data reported in the National Transit Database (NTD). Based on the audit review process, recommendations were developed to improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of Omnitrans.

Compliance with TDA Requirements

Omnitrans has complied with all applicable compliance requirements of TDA.

Status of Prior Audit Recommendations

This section reviewed Omnitrans' actions to implement eight prior audit recommendations. Five of the eight prior audit recommendations were fully implemented, two were partially implemented, and one was not implemented. Omnitrans has significantly improved its data reporting accuracy between the external reports it prepares, and also improved its financial accounting and reporting during the audit period.

System Performance Trends

1. Operating costs for Omnitrans general public service increased by just 2.6 percent over the last three years, which is remarkable given that the Consumer Price Index increased by 11.5 percent during the same period. Operating costs for Omnitrans Access service increased by 17.4 percent during the last three years, with most of that increase occurring in FY2008. Systemwide operating costs increased by 4.6 percent.
2. Ridership on general public service decreased by 4.4 percent, from 15.1 million to 14.4 million passengers, continuing a trend observed during the last audit period. Ridership on Access service decreased by 17.5 percent, from 492,108 to 405,814. The systemwide

ridership decline was 4.9 percent during the audit period. However, preliminary ridership data from July 2008 to February 2009 (after the end of the audit period) indicates that general public ridership is up about 6 percent on a per month basis from FY2008, while Access ridership has stabilized.

3. The provision of vehicle service hours and miles for general public service decreased by 3.2 percent and 5.4 percent respectively, as Omnitrans streamlined its routes in order to realize cost efficiencies. Access vehicle service hours and miles decreased by 10.8 percent and 12.8 percent respectively.
4. Operating cost per passenger increased by 9.9 percent systemwide, 7.4 percent for general public service, and 42.4 percent for Access service. Operating costs were controlled effectively on the general public side, but not for Access service. In particular, maintenance and administration operating costs for Access increased significantly in FY2008.
5. Operating cost per vehicle service hour increased by 9.7 percent systemwide, 6.1 percent for general public service, and 31.7 percent for Access service. Operating cost per vehicle service mile increased by 12.6 percent systemwide, 8.5 percent for general public service, and 34.7 percent for Access service.
6. Passengers per vehicle service hour decreased by 0.2 percent systemwide, 1.2 percent for general public service, and 7.5 percent for Access service. Passengers per vehicle service mile increased by 2.5 percent systemwide and 1.1 percent for general public service, and decreased by 5.4 percent for Access service.
7. Vehicle service hours per employee Full Time Equivalent (FTE) for general public service, which measures labor productivity, increased by 3.2 percent over the past three years. Vehicle service hours per employee FTE for Access service decreased by 6.0 percent during the audit period.
8. The fare recovery ratio for general public service increased from 20.0 percent in FY2006 to 21.9 percent in FY2008, while the fare recovery ratio for Access service declined from 14.1 percent in FY2006 to 13.1 percent in FY2008. The TDA minimum requirement is 20.0 percent for general public service and 10.0 percent for Access service for senior and disabled patrons. Omnitrans met the minimum requirements in each fiscal year during the audit period.

Functional Review

1. Vehicle operations cost indicators for directly operated fixed route service increased during the audit period. Operations cost per vehicle service hour increased by 12.9 percent, cost per vehicle service mile increased by 10.5 percent, cost per passenger trip increased by 20.8 percent, and cost per passenger mile increased by 6.6 percent. These increases are roughly in line with the increase in inflation during the audit period of 11.5 percent
2. The number of directly operated fixed route revenue accidents increased from 496 in FY2005 to 682 in FY2006. Recognizing this trend, Omnitrans actively focused on strengthening safety training during the audit period. Revenue accidents were reduced to 597 in FY2007 and to 522 in FY2008, and the overall accident rate per million vehicle service miles went down by 7.1 percent during the audit period.
3. Directly operated fixed route lost trips as a percentage of scheduled trips increased by 14.1 percent during the audit period, from 0.44 percent to 0.50 percent. There was a big spike in lost trips observed in FY2007, with the lost trip rate reaching 0.76 percent in that year, but the number of lost trips then went down in FY2008.
4. Both East Valley and West Valley operations achieved overall on-time performance above the 90 percent goal during the audit period, with the exception of West Valley in FY2007 which reported on-time performance of 88.5 percent.
5. The directly operated fixed route vehicle operator turnover rate went down during the audit period, from 8.6 percent in FY2005 to 4.8 percent in FY2008. Turnover has gone down as a result of trends in the overall economy.
6. Demand response vehicle operations cost indicators all increased by between 27 and 34 percent during the audit period as costs increased while service provision and ridership declined. Service hours per total hour and service miles per total mile decreased by 2.4 percent and 1.3 percent respectively.
7. Maintenance costs for fixed route service increased by just 1.6 percent during the audit period, significantly less than the rate of inflation. Maintenance cost per vehicle hour, per vehicle mile, and per active vehicle declined by 8.1 percent, 8.7 percent, and 3.9 percent respectively.
8. Total directly operated fixed route vehicle failures increased from 3,053 in FY2005 to 3,246 in FY2007, but then went back down to 2,953 in FY2008. Vehicle miles between failures showed a 15.0 percent improvement during the audit period.
9. For demand response service, maintenance costs increased sharply in FY2008 while the amount of service provided was reduced. Maintenance costs per vehicle hour, per vehicle

mile, and per active vehicle increased by 63.2 percent, 66.6 percent, and 38.2 percent respectively.

10. While administration costs were effectively controlled for directly operated fixed route service, they were not contained on the demand response side. This resulted in positive performance trends for fixed route service but negative performance trends for demand response service.
11. Directly operated fixed route fringe benefit costs increased by 18.2 percent during the audit period, from \$11.96 million in FY2005 to \$14.14 million in FY2008. Most of this increase took place from FY2005 to FY2007. The increase was higher than the overall Consumer Price Index (CPI) increase of 11.5 percent during the same timeframe.
12. Directly operated fixed route casualty and liability costs decreased by 42.6 percent during the audit period, from \$7.09 million in FY2005 to \$4.07 million in FY2008. Most of this decrease took place from FY2005 to FY2006.
13. The number of worker's compensation claims decreased from 107 in Calendar Year 2005 to 86 in 2006, and has since increased slightly to 90 in 2007 and to 92 in 2008. However, the average amount per claim increased from \$4,853 in 2005 to \$14,400 in 2007, and then went back down to \$6,655 in 2008. The total amount of worker's compensation claims increased by 17.9 percent from 2005 to 2008, from \$519,302 in 2005 to \$612,247 in 2008. The high was in 2007, when worker's compensation claims reached \$1,296,038.
14. The total number of employee separations from the agency across all departments decreased from 84 in Calendar Year 2005 to 80 in 2006, 73 in 2007, and 50 in 2008. The majority of separations are from operations and maintenance. Omnitrans' goal of annual turnover is between 6 and 7 percent. The turnover rate agencywide decreased from 8.6 percent in 2005 to 4.8 percent in 2008.

Recommendations

Performance Audit Recommendation	Background	Timeline
#1 Focus on Improving Demand Response Performance.	Demand response operating costs increased significantly during the audit period, at the same time that ridership declined while the amount of service provided was reduced. Farebox recovery has declined despite an appreciable increase in fare revenue collected. Omnitrans has taken measures to improve demand response performance through contractor changes in management and reporting. Stabilizing demand response operating costs should be a major focus for the agency during the next audit period.	High Priority
#2 Investigate the Potential to Restructure Service once Bus Rapid Transit is Implemented.	The new sbX Bus Rapid Transit service represents a tremendous opportunity for Omnitrans to restructure and refocus its overall service network. Omnitrans should leverage the new service with respect to timed transfer opportunities with local routes and a shift of duplicative resources to other parts of the service area.	High Priority
#3 Leverage the VMI Inventory System.	Currently, purchasing long lead items is more of a skill, independent of the features of the inventory system. In early 2009, a new inventory system Vendor Managed Inventory (VMI) was introduced by procurement. The new VMI system should be leveraged to the fullest extent possible.	High Priority
#4 Actively Integrate the SAP/ERP System Into All Functional Departments.	Utilized properly, an ERP system can drastically improve the performance and reporting accuracy of the agency. Omnitrans will have the ability to improve its overall reporting efficiency, and resolve how the TransTrack system fits in with the overall reporting process.	High Priority
#5 Report Performance Against Past Goals in the Annual Strategic Plan.	As a carry over from the prior performance audit, this recommended activity could be implemented through adding a new chapter in each of the strategic plan elements that shows actual performance against the previous year's goals. This provides a well-documented transition between the prior and current strategic plans and provide further justification for the development of the goals and activities in the current plan.	Medium Priority

**FY 2006-2008
Triennial Performance Audit
of Victor Valley Transit Authority**

**Submitted to San Bernardino
Associated Governments**

May 2009



Executive Summary

The San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) engaged the PMC consultant team to conduct the Transportation Development Act (TDA) triennial performance audit of the six public transit operators under its jurisdiction. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue. This performance audit is conducted for Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTa) covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2005-06 through 2007-08.

The audit includes a review of the following areas:

- Compliance with TDA Requirements
- Status of Prior Audit Recommendations
- System Performance Trends
- Functional Review

From the review, recommendations were developed to improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of VVTa.

Compliance with TDA Requirements

VVTa has complied with most TDA requirements. Submittal of reports to the State Controller's Office, including the annual fiscal and compliance audits and the State Controller annual transit operator reports, were not on time. The FY 2008 fiscal audit report was submitted late due to a formatting change by the auditor retained by SANBAG which delayed its completion.

Status of Prior Audit Recommendations

This section reviewed VVTa's actions to implement six prior audit recommendations. Two of the prior audit recommendations were implemented, three were partially implemented, and one was not implemented. Some of the prior recommendations are carried forward for full compliance, including reviewing data for accuracy and creating a finance officer position.

System Performance Trends

1. Operating costs systemwide increased by 32.6 percent over the past three years. Fixed route operating costs increased by 29.8 percent and demand response costs increased by 38.8 percent. During the audit period, VVTa expanded certain services and implemented a fare adjustment. As part of the Operations and Growth Analysis performed during the audit period, route headways were reduced from 70 minutes to 60 minutes in August 2007. Peak period headways on some routes were reduced further to 30 minutes in August 2008, after the end of the audit period.

2. Ridership increased by 4.9 percent systemwide, with fixed route ridership increasing 4.2 percent and demand response ridership increasing 11.5 percent. The ridership increase is notable as it took place during the same timeframe that routes were redesigned and fares were increased. To better serve the needs of special access patrons, VVTA has increased the number of deviation routes. These routes operate along fixed routes but allow ¾ mile deviation to pickup an ADA certified rider.
3. Cost efficiency and effectiveness measures generally declined over the last audit period. Operating cost per passenger increased by 26.4 percent systemwide. For fixed route service, cost per passenger increased 24.6 percent, while for demand response service cost per passenger increased 24.4 percent.
4. Service effectiveness measures showed improvement over the last audit period. Although passengers per vehicle service hour declined 3.2 percent systemwide and 7.0 percent for fixed route, passengers per hour for demand response increased by 10.3 percent. This shows a marked improvement over the previous audit period, which showed a 15 percent systemwide decline in passengers per vehicle service hour.
5. The fare recovery ratio for fixed route service decreased from 15.6 percent in FY2006 to 15.1 percent in FY2008. The fare recovery ratio for demand response service increased from 10.7 percent in FY2006 to 11.4 percent in FY2008. VVTA has complied with the minimum TDA farebox recovery ratios established by SANBAG.

Functional Review

1. VVTA operations were consolidated under ATC (now Veolia) in early 2005 when the cities of Victorville and Adelanto ceased their own bus operations that were being operated through MOU's with VVTA. Systemwide performance metrics have generally improved, but operations and maintenance costs have also increased.
2. VVTA received "satisfactory" ratings during each of the CHP terminal inspections at the maintenance facilities during the audit period. Annual inspections occurred during the first calendar quarter of each audit year, with some inspections taking several days to complete. The Veolia facility is located in Hesperia.
3. During the audit period, VVTA eliminated problematic Agent fareboxes and replaced them with electronic GFI Odyssey fareboxes. In addition, the agency began utilizing the new TransTrack reporting system to create standard reports and improve data reporting consistency.
4. The trend of customer complaints has decreased for both fixed route and demand response services during the audit period due to a change in contractor operations management. Complaints per 100,000 riders decreased by 13.3 percent in the last audit year for fixed route, and decreased 64.4 percent in the last audit year for demand response. From fiscal years 2007 to 2008, the complaints rate decreased significantly.

5. The Victor Valley Operations and Growth Analysis was completed during the audit period. The development of a five year recommended action plan was based on a number of factors including an analysis of existing service demand and utilization. Recommendations from the analysis included consideration for several planning initiatives including areas of development and potential major employment destinations in Victor Valley. The five year plan is reviewed every quarter and serves as a basis for planning decisions and service adjustments. VVTA is currently in the second year of implementing the action plan.
6. There was a particular attempt to reduce ADA expenses, which was successful. Having a more stringent ADA certification process helped in this respect, as well as enforcing a strict no-show policy. There was also an increase in graffiti and vandalism following a high population influx from 2003 to 2006. Since 2006 those occurrences have subsided.

Recommendations

Performance Audit Recommendation	Background	Timeline
#1 Create Finance Officer Position.	VVTA should hire a finance officer that is capable of managing projects such as the development of an accrual accounting system, a methodology to allocate operating expenses to transit services, and the monitoring and reporting of performance such as cost and revenue to budget as well as the traditional key performance indicators. This will help VVTA with the accuracy and timeliness of its external reporting.	High Priority
#2 Review operating cost allocation between the vehicle operations, maintenance, and administration functions.	For fixed route service, vehicle operations costs from the NTD reports increased by 20 percent while maintenance costs fell by 11 percent and administration costs fell by 9 percent. The divergence in cost trends between these functions should be investigated by reviewing the operating cost allocation methodology.	Medium Priority
#3 Actively plan for transition into new facility.	The plan to construct a new VVTA facility has been in progress for several years, and is likely to occur during the next audit period. The increased capacity and capabilities of the facility can be best realized with close collaboration between VVTA, the design firm, the service contractor and other stakeholders. Proactive planning and preparation will be valuable for addressing maintenance and operational needs, mitigating expansion issues, and providing superior service.	Medium Priority
#4 Investigate potential discrepancies in reported passenger miles.	Reported fixed route passenger miles in the NTD reports fell from 9.9 million in FY2007 to 5.9 million in FY2008, despite fixed route passenger trips increasing during that time. This potential discrepancy in passenger mile reporting should be evaluated and documented.	Medium Priority

**FY 2006-2008
Triennial Performance Audit
of Mountain Area Regional
Transit Authority**

**Submitted to San Bernardino
Associated Governments**

May 2009



Executive Summary

The San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) engaged the PMC consultant team to conduct the Transportation Development Act (TDA) triennial performance audit of the six public transit operators under its jurisdiction. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue. This performance audit is conducted for the Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA) covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2005-06 through 2007-08.

The audit includes a review of the following areas:

- Compliance with TDA Requirements
- Status of Prior Audit Recommendations
- Transit System Performance Trends
- Detailed Functional Review

From the review, recommendations were developed to improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of MARTA.

Compliance with TDA Requirements

MARTA has complied with most TDA requirements with the exception of a finding regarding the late submission of the fiscal and compliance audits for FYs 2007 and 2008. The reports were transmitted electronically to the State Controller's Office and SANBAG nearly two weeks late, with no penalties. The FY 2008 fiscal audit report was submitted late due to a formatting change by the auditor retained by SANBAG which delayed its completion.

Status of Prior Audit Recommendations

This section reviews MARTA's actions to implement four prior audit recommendations. Three of the four prior audit recommendations were fully implemented, while one was partially implemented and is carried forward in this audit for full compliance. The recommendation carried forward is for MARTA to ensure consistency between data input for the State Controller's Report and internal databases such as TransTrack. A review of comparative data during the audit period showed some data discrepancies in the earlier audit years, but improvement by the last fiscal year. This finding provides an indication that MARTA has taken steps to begin improving data consistency.

System Performance Trends

1. Operating costs systemwide increased by 34 percent over the past three years. Fixed route operating costs increased by 39 percent and dial-a-ride (DAR) costs increased 20 percent. Similar to other transit operators, increased fuel prices impacted the transit agency, causing it to increase its fuel costs by about 60 percent between fiscal years 2006 and 2008. Insurance cost also increased significantly in the past year due to an in-service vehicle accident involving a pedestrian in Big Bear Lake. A new bargaining agreement was also reached with the teamsters representing drivers and dispatchers in September 2007.
2. The trend in the systemwide fare recovery ratio over the last three years shows a slight decline. However, the fare ratio exceeded the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent each year. MARTA's implementation of improved services in February 2009 is anticipated to improve the farebox ratio, among other goals.
3. Most financial performance indicators such as operating cost per revenue hour and operating cost per passenger showed increases above the rate of inflation during the audit period. Factors influencing operations costs such as fuel, insurance and wages tended to increase faster over the past three years than the growth in vehicle hours and ridership.
4. Ridership increased by 10 percent systemwide. Fixed route passengers increased by 18 percent; however DAR ridership declined 13 percent. Peak systemwide ridership occurred in FY 2007 when it reached over 182,000, primarily due to the increase in fixed route passengers.
5. Management indicated that there was an increase in passenger complaints due to better record keeping with use of TransTrack. As shown on TransTrack, filed complaints have been driver-related (e.g., rude and discourteous drivers, or unsafe driving) or other suggestions. Reported data by MARTA shows an increase in complaints per 100,000 riders. Comments by the public include commendations as well. There were at least 7 commendations made during the audit period for a variety of reasons, including courteous drivers and assistance with making transit connections. Additional commendations have been made after the audit period.

Functional Review

1. Several changes at MARTA occurred over the past three years, including the following:
 - New transit management was introduced in September 2006. The current General Manager joined MARTA in September 2006, and the Operations Manager joined in November 2007.
 - Changes were made to internal processes to improve the accountability and general culture of the agency. Several employee handbooks and manuals were updated.

- A fare increase took effect in October 2006 which raised the Big Bear Valley general public dial-a-ride fare from \$2.00 to \$4.00. Also, the Crestline and Off the Mountain fixed route cash fare was split between a boarding fee and zonal fee; however, it did not raise the overall cash fare.
 - The Big Bear Visitors Trolley, initiated in July 2004 as a joint project between MARTA and the City of Big Bear Lake, was terminated in April 2007. Increased operating costs and required subsidies, as well as declining farebox recovery, were factors for the trolley's elimination.
 - A Comprehensive Operations Analysis was completed in August 2007 that laid the foundation for enhancements and improvements in service delivery. Although outside the audit period, a rollout of service improvements and marketing strategies occurred in February 2009 to increase service frequency and improve transit connections. A park and ride facility was also made available in Crestline. These improvements will be followed by the introduction of a new MARTA logo and anticipated fare increase.
2. The new General Manager implemented a series of policy formulations to introduce standardization and uniformity among the staff. These included development of a training manual, a personnel policy manual (still in progress), a driver handbook and an accident reporting procedure form. A probationary service policy for non-represented employees was also implemented which officially documents MARTA's probationary service practices. The implementation and familiarity of TransTrack as a performance measurement tool has also helped to standardize the tracking and reporting of data among the agency staff.
 3. Communication was another identified issue from the past. In response, regular communication has improved between the facilities and staff through changes to the overall culture and implementation of documented standards. A success factor in improved communication and policy has come from the top in that new management is more responsive to agency needs and practices fairness. The implementation of the personnel policy manual and other guidance documents has helped to communicate and assure that MARTA employees are treated consistent with Board adopted policies, which in turn has improved the agency's culture.
 4. The visibility of MARTA in relation to planning of services and local and regional issues has increased. MARTA is part of a local management group that commenced in late 2007 and meets quarterly to discuss emergency preparedness, land use and other current issues that could affect the local community. The group comprises MARTA, local politicians, top management from various departments in local agencies, the Chamber of Commerce, and state and federal governments. The management group provides MARTA a venue to communicate transit information with stakeholders and learn about new and potential developments that could impact its service. MARTA is a member of the Big Bear Lake Chamber of Commerce and will also join the Crestline, Arrowhead & Running Springs Chamber of Commerce.

5. For most California Highway Patrol (CHP) inspections, only minor vehicle and driver records violations were reported and MARTA continued to maintain "satisfactory" ratings. However, MARTA received an "unsatisfactory" rating during a CHP terminal inspection on February 1, 2006. The CHP inspector found nine violations that MARTA had failed to comply with Controlled Substance and Alcohol Testing Program requirements by failing to remove a covered employee from maintaining/operating an agency vehicle following a verified positive random substance test result. MARTA had 120 days to resolve these issues, and upon a subsequent CHP inspection on June 6, 2006, it received a "satisfactory" rating.
6. To better manage dial-a-ride operations, MARTA recently enforced its "Late Cancellation" and "No Show" policy. The policy is documented and is provided to the public via a link on the agency's Internet website. The new bus schedule also describes the policy. No shows and late cancellations have posed past problems and were tracked, but the policy was not enforced previously.
7. Management indicated that maintaining consistent on-time performance has been an ongoing issue due to the roadway layout and seasonal conditions in the service area. There is only one main road that collects most of the traffic, and during peak tourist seasons, traffic congestion often results which affects the buses' on-time performance. Management stated that riders do not typically complain about the fixed route bus schedule because it is a known condition that buses do not arrive at the exact scheduled time. MARTA should continue developing a formal on-time monitoring program to gauge the timely arrival of buses at designated stops.
8. In the past, drivers used pouches to collect fares on board the vehicles, posing security and safety risks. Fareboxes purchased from Humboldt Transit Authority in northern California are currently being installed to relieve drivers from handling cash fares. The agency plans to use a homeland security grant to install video cameras at both the Big Bear and Crestline facilities for safety and security.
9. MARTA has been able to improve its maintenance performance target of revenue miles between roadcalls from past years. The availability of a mechanics assistant at each facility, even with recent turnover at the Big Bear facility, has improved MARTA's ability to maintain vehicles and allows the Maintenance Manager flexibility to fill in where needed on preventive maintenance and vehicle repairs. New vehicle purchases will also help with reducing roadcalls.
10. The maintenance department currently does not have a functioning maintenance software package to electronically track and centralize maintenance activities and parts inventory at both facilities. As such, only original hard copies of work orders are available, with no electronic backup. Under prior management, maintenance software was purchased and installed at MARTA, but the current Maintenance Manager indicated it is too complex to use. Other priorities have prevented any training on the software.

Recommendations

Performance Audit Recommendation	Background	Timeline
#1 Enhance maintenance departmental controls through utilization of software.	MARTA has installed maintenance software but it is currently unused due to lack of training. Most vehicle maintenance activities are documented on hard copies and filed, while inventory tracking is typically kept by memory. Converting these methods into electronic format using maintenance software will provide several benefits, including improving the ability to analyze trends, centralizing all maintenance-related activity for both facilities, and creating electronic backups to the hard copy files. MARTA should either provide training on the available software or investigate purchasing a new package.	High Priority
#2 Develop performance targets for each transit mode using the suggested MARTA Operations Analysis standards as a reference.	MARTA currently uses its own set of performance measures that are contained in the Board packets. These measures are systemwide targets for certain performance data like total passengers, service hours and miles, total fare revenue and operating expenses. Because the types of services offered differ significantly within the MARTA system (local fixed route, OTM and DAR), it is recommended that individual standards also be developed for each transit mode to enable a more thorough evaluation of performance. Each mode can have its own set of performance standards that are customized to that type of service. The MARTA Comprehensive Operations Analysis prepared in August 2007 provides a starting point of benchmarks that could be considered for each transit mode.	High Priority
#3 Ensure updated trip sheets account for driver break time during revenue service.	The current trip sheets do not have an area to fill in break time, which is when there is not an expectation of carrying a passenger. Break time during revenue service should be excluded when determining revenue hours (however, scheduled layover for fixed route is considered part of revenue service). MARTA indicated it is redesigning the trip sheets and should include room for drivers to record break time duration (beginning and end time) and their location. Excluding break time will further meet the TDA definition of vehicle revenue hours.	High Priority
#4 Formalize tracking of on-time performance for fixed route.	In spite of management's indication that maintaining consistent on-time performance has been an ongoing issue due to the roadway layout and seasonal conditions in the service area, this provides more reason to have a consistent methodology for measuring on-time performance. By having the fixed route drivers call in to dispatch in the middle and at the end of each run with their location, the dispatch logs should indicate the time and location of each call that could be reviewed by operations management. A formal on-time monitoring program could assist with continuous service improvements that will enhance the reliability and visibility of MARTA to the public. Various tools to measure on-time performance are available, such as regular supervisor observation at timed checkpoints, shadow riding and documenting all driver call-ins to dispatch at preselected stops.	Medium Priority
#5 Designate one administrative staff member to cross-check the TransTrack data and the annual State Controller's Reports.	The linkage between preparation of the State Controller's Reports and the TransTrack data should improve. Information in TransTrack that is designed to be imported into the report was either missing or did not match. A comparison of the data between TransTrack and the State Controller's Report should be conducted by one designated person prior to submission to the State. This cross-checking should ensure uniformity in the performance data being presented to the public.	Medium Priority

**FY 2006-2008
Triennial Performance Audit
of Morongo Basin Transit Authority**

**Submitted to San Bernardino
Associated Governments**

May 2009



Executive Summary

The San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) engaged the PMC consultant team to conduct the Transportation Development Act (TDA) triennial performance audit of the six public transit operators under its jurisdiction. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue. This performance audit is conducted for Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA) covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2005-06 through 2007-08.

The audit includes a review of the following areas:

- Compliance with TDA Requirements
- Status of Prior Audit Recommendations
- Transit System Performance Trends
- Detailed Functional Review

From the review, recommendations were developed to improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of MBTA.

Compliance with TDA Requirements

MBTA has complied with most TDA requirements with two exceptions. One is that the FYs 2007 and 2008 fiscal audits were submitted to SANBAG and the State Controller after the statutory due date. The fiscal audit report was submitted late due to a formatting change by the auditor retained by SANBAG which delayed its completion. The other exception is the reporting of full-time equivalents (FTEs) in TransTrack and in the State Controller's Reports. MBTA has not been reporting FTEs in TransTrack, and the data was missing in the FY 2008 report submitted to the State.

Status of Prior Audit Recommendations

Three of the five prior audit recommendations were implemented. One prior recommendation no longer applies which relates to development of a formal fare subsidy agreement with Copper Mountain College. The other prior recommendation that was partially implemented is carried forward in this audit for full implementation, which is for MBTA to accurately record full-time equivalents in the State Controller's Report and in TransTrack.

System Performance Trends

1. The budget did not increase significantly during the audit period, as the largest year-over-year increase was 5 percent between fiscal years 2006 and 2007. Although fuel cost increased significantly in the earlier years of the audit, alternative fuel prices for the compressed natural gas (CNG) buses have stabilized over the past year. LTF carryover funds from one year to the next have been from overbudgeting for fuel costs.
2. Operating costs systemwide remained relatively flat over the past three years, increasing by 6 percent, well below the cumulative rate of inflation. Fixed route operating costs decreased by 7 percent while dial-a-ride (DAR) costs increased 25 percent. The transit system was not impacted as severely during the fluctuations in gasoline fuel prices since the entire fleet is powered by CNG. The agency was able to fill key management positions in 2008, while an accident in April 2008 pushed insurance rates higher.
3. Ridership increased by 18 percent systemwide. Fixed route passengers increased by 21 percent; however DAR ridership declined 8 percent. The service as a whole did not change very much during the audit period, pending the outcome of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) in 2007. The fluctuations in gasoline prices in past years might have been a contributing factor that increased ridership, along with incremental adjustments made to the service by MBTA.
4. Performance measures using operating costs and service variables such as passengers and service hours showed mostly positive trends. For example, operating cost per passenger decreased 10 percent systemwide over the past three years, a positive indicator showing that ridership increased faster than operating costs. In addition, operating cost per hour increased systemwide by 10 percent which is at the cumulative rate of inflation over a three year period.
5. Passengers per hour increased 23 percent systemwide as well as for the fixed route. DAR passengers per hour also increased but at a more modest pace. Ridership grew while revenue hours decreased, which is a positive indicator from a service effectiveness perspective.
6. The trend in the fare recovery ratio shows general stability. The farebox ratio for MBTA increased slightly in the past three years, ranging from 18.35 percent in FY 2006 to 19.04 percent in FY 2007 to 18.40 percent in FY 2008. The TDA minimum ratio of 10 percent was met in each year. Farebox for fixed route remained in the 22 percent recovery range while DAR was relatively stable. Fare revenues are enhanced from group pass sales and the annual subsidy provided by the fundraising foundation of Copper Mountain College.
7. For most inspections, only minor vehicle and driver records violations were reported by the CHP, and MBTA continued to maintain "satisfactory" ratings. However, during the January 2006 inspection, the CHP determined MBTA was out of compliance and gave an "unsatisfactory" terminal rating because MBTA had failed to enroll a driver with the DMV Pull Notice Program. Upon a subsequent reinspection in March 2006, the CHP deemed the terminal "satisfactory."

Functional Review

1. The agency underwent top-level management changes, including the recruitment of a new General Manager, a new Operations Director, finance administration staff, and a new driver/trainer. The prior General Manager left to become city manager of Twentynine Palms.
2. The MBTA Comprehensive Operations Analysis developed in May 2007 contained a list of suggested performance standards and benchmarks to help evaluate current services. The local fixed route service appears to meet the COA performance benchmarks. The General Manager has developed a separate set of internal performance targets to gauge performance of the transit service. The targets set annual and monthly benchmarks based on previous year data for systemwide operating costs, farebox ratio, passengers, cost per passenger, and revenue per passenger.
3. Although outside the audit period, the new Yucca Valley Transit Center opened in March 2009 with some fixed route realignment to meet at the transit center. The sawtooth design of the new transit center includes eight bays and passenger amenities such as restrooms.
4. In April 2008, an accident occurred which involved a fatality and a MBTA bus vehicle. The fatality was a pedestrian in a wheelchair near an intersection. As a result, MBTA's general liability insurance is budgeted to increase approximately \$25,000 to \$30,000 between fiscal years 2008 and 2009, according to CalTIP conservative estimates.
5. MBTA implements a safety incentive program that recognizes driver safety. Each time a driver maintains a safe record for 100 days, the milestone is recognized by management. Continuous feedback from management and supervisors regarding each driver's record of safety has helped to reinforce this program. There is quarterly training for four hours including defensive driving.
6. An observation made during the site visit, and concurred by the maintenance supervisor, is that the inventory of parts and equipment at the facility is not electronically entered into Fleet Controller or other software. While parts are recorded as they are used, there is no electronic record keeping of remaining available parts or triggers when restocking is needed. This is currently undertaken by visual inspection. It is recommended that MBTA consider electronically integrating parts inventory that is linked to parts usage or create electronic record keeping of parts through a spreadsheet that will enable a comprehensive view of all parts and their value.
7. The General Manager is involved with local planning and interjects where transit amenities would be beneficial for transit. MBTA is involved with local planning efforts of the City of Twentynine Palms and the Town of Yucca Valley and makes requests for transit amenities during the planning and development process. Developers have helped pay for and install bus shelters as part of the mitigation requirements during the building stage.
8. The MBTA Board is kept abreast of transit activities through a number of Board reports. In spite of the changeover in General Managers, the MBTA board agendas have largely remained the

same and reflect a similar format to the City Council packets. Monthly board meetings are accompanied by a spiral-bound agenda packet.

Recommendations

Performance Audit Recommendation	Background	Timeline
#1 Develop/install software program to track vehicle parts inventory electronically.	The current maintenance software does not include a module that allows a vehicle parts inventory to be kept electronically nor linked to use of the parts for vehicle maintenance. As current inventory control is conducted manually, an electronic inventory program can help to consolidate and manage inventory functions such as tracking cycle counts, updating parts availability as they are used, and automatic notification when parts need to be restocked. Automating these functions could increase the efficiency for the maintenance department. Electronic management of parts inventory through an additional module to the existing maintenance software or from a separate spreadsheet program can also be backed up on the server.	High Priority
#2 Record key operations data such as on-time performance, roadcalls and accidents into TransTrack.	For TransTrack to be an effective performance monitoring tool, key performance data should be entered in a timely manner. The data includes on-time performance, number of roadcalls and collision accidents. TransTrack will in turn calculate performance measures that provide trend information about the transit system, such as revenue miles between roadcalls and revenue miles between accidents. MBTA currently tracks this information through internal reports and should make it available on TransTrack.	High Priority
#3 Strengthen the method for determining on-time performance for dial-a-ride.	There should be alternative means to verify on-time performance in addition to reviewing driver manifests. One alternative is to have DAR drivers call in to dispatch at certain pickups/drop-offs to confirm their timepoint. A sampling of call-ins to dispatch can be made on a predetermined basis against which the manifests could be verified. These additional measures could also help with enforcing the no show policy and guard the agency against unwarranted complaints.	High Priority
#4 Provide side-by-side comparison of planned versus actual performance indicators and include in Board meeting agendas.	MBTA maintains internal monthly targets for performance indicators such as systemwide operating costs, farebox ratio, passengers, cost per passenger, and revenue per passenger. While management reviews the planned indicators versus actual performance, this information should also be presented to the Board. A comparison of these targets against actual data for the month should be added to the Board meeting materials as an additional measure of the service, similar to the comparison of budget information that shows budgeted against actuals.	Medium Priority
#5 Properly record correct full-time equivalents into TransTrack and the State Controller's Report.	The correct count of full-time equivalents should be reported in the State Controller's plan module in TransTrack, which should serve as the basis for completing the actual State Controller's Report that is submitted to the State and SANBAG. Currently, this data is missing in TransTrack.	Medium Priority

**FY 2006-2008
Triennial Performance Audit
of Barstow Area Transit**

**Submitted to San Bernardino
Associated Governments**

May 2009



Executive Summary

The San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) engaged the PMC consultant team to conduct the Transportation Development Act (TDA) triennial performance audit of the six public transit operators under its jurisdiction. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue. This performance audit is conducted for Barstow Area Transit (BAT) covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2005-06 through 2007-08.

The audit includes a review of the following areas:

- Compliance with TDA Requirements
- Status of Prior Audit Recommendations
- Transit System Performance Trends
- Detailed Functional Review

From the review, recommendations were developed to improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of BAT.

Compliance with TDA Requirements

BAT has complied with most TDA requirements with three exceptions. One is that the reporting of full-time equivalents in the State Controller's Reports was inaccurately shown, as the figures varied significantly each year. Another exception is that the FY 2007-08 fiscal audit was not submitted to the State according to the statutory timeline. The FY 2008 fiscal audit report was submitted late due to a formatting change by the auditor retained by SANBAG which delayed its completion. The third, and more significant exception, was that BAT did not meet the 10 percent farebox recovery standard in FY 2008, placing the service out of compliance with a key TDA measure. A pattern of not meeting the farebox standard could have funding implications in future years.

Status of Prior Audit Recommendations

This section reviewed BAT's actions to implement six prior audit recommendations. Of the six recommendations, two were fully implemented, one is in the process of being implemented, two were not implemented and are furthered in this audit for full compliance, and one was no longer applicable. The one prior recommendation in the process of being implemented is adding transit administrative assistance which is dependent on budgetary considerations. The two recommendations that are furthered for full compliance include conducting independent on-time performance checks and improving the visual depiction of the bus map.

System Performance Trends

1. BAT received "satisfactory" ratings for each CHP terminal inspection during the audit period.
2. The trend in the fare recovery ratio shows a general decline during the audit period. The farebox ratio for BAT service (excluding Big River and Trona Transit systems) decreased slightly from 11.0 percent in FY 2006 to 9.6 percent in FY 2008 for BAT. Over the past six years, the farebox ratio has declined from about 14 percent to under 10 percent. The TDA minimum ratio of 10 percent was not met in FY 2008, placing the service out of compliance with a key TDA measure. The farebox recovery ratios for Big River Transit and Trona Transit exceeded the 10 percent ratio in each year of the audit, but have been declining as well.
3. Operating costs for Barstow Area Transit increased by 56 percent over the past three years, with fixed route increasing more than dial-a-ride (DAR) in percentage terms. Contract operations cost increased with the expanded fixed routes, along with a renegotiation for increased hourly driver rates which have been below market. Maintenance cost from an older fleet increased as well, which required additional funding for the contract operator. Fuel cost increases were a primary reason for the significant change in cost, as fuel expenses more than doubled for the transit system between fiscal years 2005 and 2006.
4. Ridership increased by 9 percent systemwide, including by 25 percent on fixed route, but declined by 10 percent on dial-a-ride. The conversion of the popular DAR service on the eastern end of Barstow to a fixed route service partly explains the trend. Ridership on both Big River and Trona Transit decreased significantly over the last three years, between 30 and 50 percent. The City indicated that the clientele may be moving away from the area or not riding as much.
5. The rate of service provision, expressed in growth in hours and miles of service, grew in close proportion to the growth in operating costs. Other performance measures such as cost per passenger and passengers per hour showed negative trends.

Functional Review

1. Changes to the system included expansion of the fixed route system in September 2005 from three to five routes. A demonstration service from Barstow to Fort Irwin was implemented for a month during September 2008 with relative success. In addition, a new county volunteer demand response service at Havasu Lake was ready to be implemented but was cancelled due to lack of volunteers.
2. BAT has had past issues with the timing of purchasing replacement vehicles due to lack of appropriate scheduling according to the transit plans. Significant vehicle purchases

began in FY 2007-08 which are reflected in the federal capital funds being used during that year. Funding had already been programmed by SANBAG, and upon the change in the Coordinator position, action was taken to get new buses delivered.

3. The long-time Transportation Coordinator retired from the position in 2007 and was replaced by the Management Analyst II. The Analyst previously served as the transit administrator on a short-term interim basis between December 2005 and March 2006. In April 2009, after the audit period, the City conducted interviews and hired a new full time Transportation Coordinator which is filled by the former Management Analyst.
4. MV Transportation changed management in June 2006 by replacing the previous Transit Manager. Internal contractor issues required the replacement of the Transit Manager. BAT issued an RFP and through a competitive bid retained the same contract operator to continue operating and maintaining the system. A new five-year service contract through 2013 was approved and commenced on July 1, 2008.
5. A new ADA application and recertification process was implemented to improve enforcement with rider eligibility. The Transportation Coordinator received assistance from SANBAG transit staff in the development of the form. The new application form provides more thorough questions about mobility impairment and a new section that requires completion by the applicant's health care professional. The new form provides a level of eligibility standard to the certification process and establishes clear timelines and responsibilities to become certified.
6. A new comment card is available on the buses to receive feedback from riders. Developed by the City in 2008 as a result of the transit unmet needs hearings, the comment card is postcard-sized and addressed to City Hall for easy mailing. The card includes lines to identify the bus number and driver, as drivers are now required to wear an identification badge. Five categories to rate the service are shown on the card.
7. A new head mechanic was brought onto BAT's contract operator in 2006, replacing the former Maintenance Manager who had been with BAT for about two years. During most of the audit period, the BAT vehicle fleet was aging and required replacement.

Recommendations

Performance Audit Recommendation	Background	Timeline
#1 Verify TransTrack data regularly.	Several performance statistics entered into TransTrack during the audit period were not representative of the service, based on missing or incomplete nature of the data. This was most prevalent in FY 2005-06 which underrepresented the data for the year. The data prepared for TransTrack feeds into the annual State Controller's Transit Operator's Report that is submitted to SANBAG and the State, and from which some funding decisions are made. It is recommended that City transit administration closely monitor the data being prepared in TransTrack and work with contract transit management to identify potential data collection and entry issues.	High Priority
#2 Consider implementing the liquidated damages provisions in operations contract.	With TransTrack slowly being improved as a central data collection source, the City has the ability to monitor for the performance measures in the contract that are linked to financial liquidated damages. The measures include missed service hours, on-time performance and number of complaints. With the farebox recovery ratio declining over the past several years and going below the SANBAG adopted minimum requirement for continued funding, the City should utilize available means in the current contract to monitor the service and take financial action for any service deficiencies. Implementing this program will require working with the contract operator and agreeing on the method by which these indicators will be measured.	High Priority
#3 Conduct independent on-time performance checks.	The contract operator, MV Transportation, is required to conduct on-time performance checks and record the findings in TransTrack. The contract operator will use its own methods to track on-time performance in consultation with city transit staff. The Transportation Coordinator, in turn, should conduct regular checks as well to confirm and verify the data being collected by the contractor. This is an aspect of good industry practice when contract providers are used. The Transportation Coordinator and the contractor might agree and select certain stops to determine on-time performance using either video imaging and/or trip sheets and in-person site observation. As on-time performance relative to minimum standards is identified as an issue, it should be closely monitored for improvements.	High Priority

Performance Audit Recommendation	Background	Timeline
#4 Present regular updates to the City Council about Barstow Area Transit.	The Transportation Coordinator is anticipating the opportunity to provide regular performance and financial information to the City Council about BAT. A summary packet that highlights the performance of the system, such as ridership, operating costs, complaints and farebox recovery, should be discussed as possible information to present. Monthly or quarterly budget data comparing budgeted with actual figures is also a common presentation item. Transit staff should work with the Council and determine the appropriate data to include.	High Priority
#5 Improve visual depiction of bus routes and landmarks on bus map and on website.	This recommendation from the previous performance audit is warranted for full implementation. A clear comprehensive bus map to accompany the route schedules is a marketing feature that is essential to having good customer service and encouraging ridership. Identified landmarks such as social services, government buildings, schools, shopping and health care facilities provide an added convenience factor to the bus map from which both existing and potential riders can plan their trips. Maps developed from technology such as GIS can bring together bus routes, street names and landmarks.	Medium Priority
#6 Place revised ADA certification application on-line.	The updated ADA certification application should be available as a PDF download on the City's website for accessibility by the public. This can reduce the burden of calls into dispatch for an application and mailing, although questions about the application should still go through either the City or the contractor.	Medium Priority

**FY 2006-2008
Triennial Performance Audit
of Needles Transit Services**

**Submitted to San Bernardino
Associated Governments**

May 2009



Executive Summary

The San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) engaged the PMC consultant team to conduct the Transportation Development Act (TDA) triennial performance audit of the six public transit operators under its jurisdiction. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue. This performance audit is conducted for Needles Transit Services covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2005-06 through 2007-08.

The audit includes a review of the following areas:

- Compliance with TDA Requirements
- Status of Prior Audit Recommendations
- Transit System Performance Trends
- Detailed Functional Review

From the review, recommendations were developed to improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of Needles Transit Services.

Compliance with TDA Requirements

The City of Needles has complied with all applicable compliance requirements of TDA.

Status of Prior Audit Recommendations

Five of the eight prior audit recommendations were implemented. One of the recommendations is in the process of being implemented, and the other two recommendations have not been implemented. Two of these recommendations are carried forward in this audit for full compliance by the City (calculate number of full-time equivalent employees in TransTrack, and implement customer comment card).

System Performance Trends

1. The budget increased significantly between fiscal years 2006 and 2007 to account for the transition between Needles Area Transit (NAT) contract operators, start-up costs for the new contractor, and the need to conduct major repairs to the transit vehicles. Fuel prices were also beginning to rise which added to the costs. Since this transition, the budget has remained fairly stable.
2. Both deviated fixed route and dial-a-ride (DAR) exceeded their respective fare recovery ratios. However, the deviated fixed route farebox has been declining during the audit period, decreasing from 18.0 percent in FY 2006 to 10.6 percent in FY 2008. Operating costs grew at a faster pace than passenger fares. The trend in the fare recovery ratio for dial-a-ride showed overall growth. The audited farebox ratio increased from 15.7 percent

in FY 2006 to 16.7 percent in FY 2008. The contract between the City and the Senior Citizens Club sets a farebox recovery rate of 15 percent.

3. Operating costs systemwide increased by 45 percent over the past three years. Deviated fixed route operating costs increased by 48 percent and DAR costs increased by 28 percent. The growth in deviated fixed route operating cost resulted from the switch to a new contract operator starting in September 2006. A new set of fixed and variable costs proposed by McDonald Transit, start-up costs, and the factoring of projected fuel costs into the contract contributed to the contract increase. The increased cost for DAR was due to increases in labor, fuel and vehicle insurance during the audit period.
4. Ridership decreased slightly by 4 percent systemwide, including a modest 2 percent on deviated fixed route, but by 19 percent on the dial-a-ride. However, DAR ridership has been slowly increasing over the last few years from the earlier declines. There is only one part-time paid driver (plus one backup driver) available to provide trips, which has impacted the level of ridership. The overall decline in ridership may also be attributed to passengers leaving the area or not needing a ride anymore. Concern has also been expressed by the City that there is a growing perception of DAR being only a senior service, when in fact non-senior disabled riders are eligible. The Lunch Bunch nutrition shuttle during the middle of revenue service contributes to that perception.
5. Performance indicators that measure operating costs relative to other indicators such as ridership, hours and miles of service showed negative trends. Cost increased significantly while ridership and service hours and miles were either flat or decreasing.

Functional Review

1. During the audit period, the former contract operator located in Mohave Valley, Arizona, was no longer able to provide NAT service. The transfer of the NAT deviated fixed route vehicles from Laidlaw Education Services to the new contractor, McDonald Transit, was difficult given that the vehicles were found to be in poor operating condition. However, McDonald Transit was able to repair the vehicles and comply with all terminal inspection conditions by the time of the follow-up CHP visit. The NAT vehicles were brought back and stored in Needles rather than in a location in Mohave Valley, Arizona. This is significant because regular vehicle inspections could now be conducted by the CHP.
2. The NAT deviated fixed route service remained the same, but added a new stop (#32) at the Dollar Tree store which opened in early 2008 in the southeastern portion of the city along Highway 95 south and I-40.
3. A fare increase took effect on August 1, 2008 (Resolution No. 7-8-08) which raised all the one-way fares by 15 cents for the NAT service. A public hearing was held in the process. The fare increase was intended to help offset the increased cost of fuel and other

operating expenses. The 30-punch pass increased by close to 20 percent, from \$24.00 to \$28.50. DAR fares did not change.

4. New vehicles were purchased in 2007 and 2008 and replaced aging buses that were found to have significant repair problems during inspections by the CHP.
5. Although slightly outside the audit period, on October 21, 2008, the City implemented a pre-scheduled medical transportation service from Needles to Bullhead City, Arizona. The offering of the new service was a result of action taken from public comments made at the annual SANBAG unmet transit needs hearings, as well as findings from the Public Transit-Human Services Plan prepared for San Bernardino County. Over the first quarter, the service has been underutilized.

Recommendations

Performance Audit Recommendation	Background	Timeline
#1 Request that Public Works document maintenance activities of dial-a-ride vehicles.	Transit Services Manager should require mechanics within Public Works to maintain documented copies of maintenance performed on the transit vehicles. Transit staff should develop a service request form or work order for the mechanics to fill out key maintenance items including vehicle identification, mileage, type of service, parts, labor and cost. The forms should be filed by vehicle for each work order and stored by the Transit Services Manager.	High Priority
#2 Consider implementing the liquidated damages provisions in operations contract.	With TransTrack slowly being improved as a central data collection source, the City has the ability to monitor for the performance measures in the contract that are linked to financial liquidated damages. The measures include late start-up, missed revenue service hours, on-time performance, customer complaints, defective equipment, uncleaned vehicle, inoperable vehicles and monthly reporting. With the farebox recovery ratio declining over the past several years and hovering near the SANBAG adopted minimum requirement for continued funding, the City should utilize available means in the current contract to monitor the service and take financial action for any service deficiencies. Implementing this program will require working with the contract operator and agreeing on the method by which these indicators will be measured.	High Priority

Performance Audit Recommendation	Background	Timeline
#3 Enter dial-a-ride performance data into TransTrack in a timely manner.	The Transit Services Manager acknowledged that several performance measures for dial-a-ride are not entered into TransTrack in a timely manner or not at all, leaving gaps in information. These measures include number of accidents, roadcalls and complaints. Data must be entered into TransTrack regularly for the computer program to be effective in helping to monitor performance.	High Priority
#4 Present regular updates to the City Council about Needles Area Transit.	The Transit Services Manager should have the opportunity to provide regular performance and financial information to the City Council about NAT. A summary packet that highlights the performance of the system, such as ridership, operating costs, complaints and farebox recovery, should be discussed as possible information to present. Monthly or quarterly budget data comparing budgeted with actual figures is also a common presentation item. Transit staff should work with the Council and determine the appropriate data to include and how often (e.g., quarterly or annual presentations).	High Priority
#5 Ensure that the number of full-time equivalent employees is being calculated in TransTrack.	Because TransTrack is not currently showing this calculation of full-time equivalent employees (FTEs), the City should continue its progress to record annual work hours from all transit-related employees into the software. This is a carry-over recommendation from the prior audit.	Medium Priority
#6 Develop and implement customer comment card.	The City has not yet implemented a customer comment card. Several examples from other transit providers were provided by the performance auditor for helpful tips. It is anticipated the City will implement its own comment card in the near future, as comment cards provide a convenient method for the riding public to provide feedback about the service and report any problems with their transit trip. The cards also help with planning for service adjustments.	Medium Priority

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 26

Date: July 1, 2009

Subject: Capital Project Needs Analysis (CPNA) and Measure I Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs)

Recommendation:* Information on upcoming request for CPNAs and CIPs by SANBAG

Background: This item provides notice of the upcoming July 1, 2009 request for preparation of Capital Project Needs Analyses (CPNAs) and Measure I Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs). With regard to the CPNAs, this will initiate the annual apportionment and allocation process established by SANBAG's adoption of the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan in April 2009. CPNAs are to be prepared by SANBAG and its member agencies for the applicable Measure I 2010-2040 funding programs as described below.

Each Measure I program, with the exception of the Local Street and Senior/Disabled Transit Programs, will require submission of a CPNA. Local jurisdictions are responsible for preparing the CPNAs for the Valley Major Street Program, Valley Freeway Interchange Program, and the various Mountain/Desert Major Local Highway (MLH) Programs. SANBAG staff is required to prepare CPNAs for all other Measure I programs. The CPNAs cover a five year period that commences the following fiscal year (the first CPNAs will address funds received in Fiscal Year 2010-2011). The CPNAs document project or program needs by fiscal year and include anticipated funding sources, funding amounts, and project phasing where appropriate. The CPNAs also demonstrate the availability of development mitigation fair share funds for the Valley Freeway

*

*Approved
Board of Directors*

Date: _____

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

Interchange, Valley Major Street, and the Victor Valley Major Local Highway Programs.

SANBAG staff will consolidate the CPNA request with the request for Capital Improvement Plans for each jurisdiction's Measure I Local Street Program funds (the Measure I pass-through funds). The due date for both the CPNAs and the Capital Improvement Plans will be the same. This communication will provide guidance on how to distinguish the use of Measure I 1990-2010 Local Street Program funds from the use of Measure I 2010-2040 Local Street Program funds.

CPNAs for the five years beginning in FY 2010/2011 are due to SANBAG by September 30, 2009, in accordance with Strategic Plan Policies VS-4, VVMLH-5, and MDMLH-5. A sample CPNA template applicable to the Valley and Victor Valley subareas is included as Attachment 1 to this agenda item. Consistent with Strategic Plan Policy MDMLH-5 rural subareas of San Bernardino County can submit a written request for MLH funds to SANBAG, should funds be required within the five year planning horizon. The written request shall specify the scope of the project for which funds are requested, the amount and type of funding from all sources needed to fully fund the project, and the project needs to be included in the master list of MLH projects for the applicable subarea.

SANBAG staff will include guidance for CPNA preparation with the request for submittals. Local jurisdictions and SANBAG have 90 days to complete the spreadsheet with the relevant project information. In accordance with the Strategic Plan, the information provided by the CPNAs will enable SANBAG to complete a cash flow analysis in Fall 2009 that will match the revenue projections and program needs over the five year period, leading to the February 2010 approval of a financially feasible apportionment of Measure I dollars for the first full year of Measure I 2010-2040. The apportionment to programs and allocation to projects will be used by SANBAG and local jurisdictions in budgeting for FY 2010/2011.

SANBAG staff will be available to work with individual jurisdictions and subareas on the development of their CPNAs during the submittal period. Additional coordination of CPNA submittals will be needed in Mountain/Desert subareas in recognition of the strategy that each subarea has developed or is developing for use of Major/Local Highways Program funds. Meetings with local jurisdiction staff and subarea representatives may be needed midway in the submittal period to develop coordinated CPNA proposals, based on the resources expected to be available. These coordinated proposals will flow through the

apportionment and allocation approval process outlined in Strategic Plan policies for Mountain/Desert subareas.

Financial Impact: This item has no financial impact. All staff activities are consistent with the current Board adopted FY 2009/2010 Budget, TN 60909000 Agency Strategic Planning.

Reviewed By: This item was discussed at the Comprehensive Transportation Plan Technical Advisory Committee on June 8, 2009, and was reviewed by the Plans and Programs Committee on June 17, 2009 and the Mountain/Desert Committee on June 19, 2009.

Responsible Staff: Ryan Graham, Transportation Planning Analyst

ATTACHMENT 1 SAMPLE CPNA

Capital Project Needs Analysis
City of Fontana
Valley Arterial Sub-Program (Reserved)
(\$000s)

Provide Project Description

Select Jurisdiction Name from Drop-down List

Select Measure I Program from Drop-down List

Project Information	Phase	Funding	PRIOR	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15
Widen "X" Street between 2nd Ave and 5th Ave from 2 to 4 lanes. Total Project Cost: \$18,380 Total Measure I Request: \$6,990 Comments: Demo Funds are from SAFETEA-LU	PA&ED	Total Cost: \$700.00 Fund Type: DEV SPON MI VMS Other:		350 350				
	PS&E	Total Cost: \$1,500.00 Fund Type: DEV SPON MI VMS Other:			750 750			
	ROW	Total Cost: \$640.00 Fund Type: DEV SPON MI VMS Other:				320 320		
	CONST	Total Cost: \$15,540.00 Fund Type: DEV SPON MI VMS DEMO Other:						5570 5570 4400

Select Project Phase from Drop-down List

Select Fund Type from Drop-down List

Input project funding Information in the first year you will need the funds for the phase of the project

Provide any additional comments relevant to the project.

Total the amount of Measure I requested for the project.

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 27

Date: July 1, 2009

Subject: Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program Opportunity Notice

Recommendation:

- 1) Approve the Program Opportunity Notice (PON)
- 2) Authorize SANBAG staff to work with MDAB jurisdictions to develop candidate project list as outlined in the PON.

Background: At the January 16, 2009 SANBAG Mountain Desert Committee meeting, SANBAG staff reported on the availability of CMAQ funds for allocation to the Mojave Desert jurisdictions. The MDAB apportionment is approximately 18% of the total CMAQ received, or roughly \$4.8M per year in recent years.

To recap the information from the January 16, 2009 item, as of today, the region has obligated \$8.2M of CMAQ in the MDAB area and \$57.4M CMAQ in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Note that the Mountain areas are part of the SCAB. The MDAB unprogrammed balance is about \$10M. Projecting the amount of MDAB CMAQ available to be programmed, the constraints are summarized below.

- **OA limitations:** The annual availability of OA determines the amount of federal reimbursement that a region can obtain each year. No distinction exists between OA for the MDAB and SCAB areas. Large projects such as several now being delivered by SANBAG can exhaust all OA available within a particular year.
- **OA loan payback:** In the past, SANBAG borrowed \$16M in OA from RCTC to deliver the State Route 210 projects and avoid funds being lost or reprogrammed. This loan is scheduled to be paid back in Fiscal Years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

Approved
Board of Directors

Date: _____

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

- Transit funding: Transit set-asides vary from \$1.5M to \$2M per year. The funding is available to all Desert area transit districts.

SANBAG staff has coordinated with Desert local jurisdiction staff to solicit candidate projects to utilize the available MDAB CMAQ funds in the region. The goal is to produce a list of strategic projects that will fully meet CMAQ eligibility criteria while addressing the priority needs of the Desert areas. SANBAG staff in coordination with SANBAG's Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality consultant, Ray Gorski, is recommending release of a Program Opportunity Notice (PON) to request submittal of pre-proposals by Desert local jurisdictions that describe the conceptual projects in sufficient detail to enable their evaluation. Each project submitted in response to the PON will be evaluated by SANBAG staff and a committee to consist of local jurisdictions, Caltrans, and SCAG. SANBAG staff will present the recommended projects to the Mountain Desert Committee and to the SANBAG Board for final programming in the federal transportation improvement program.

The total funding available under the Mojave Desert Air Basin CMAQ Program is estimated to be \$2M each year from the Fiscal Year 2009-2010 to Fiscal Year 2011-2012. SANBAG will continue to work to ensure that funding opportunities will be made available to all jurisdictions in the Desert area and to develop a consensus project list.

Financial Impact: This item has no financial impact to the approved Fiscal Year 2008-2009 SANBAG budget. This item will result in identification of a consensus list of CMAQ-eligible Desert area projects to be awarded funding totaling about \$2.0 million per year for three fiscal years. Lead agencies for selected projects will receive project funding on a cost reimbursement basis through Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance.

Reviewed By: This item was reviewed and unanimously recommended for approval by the Mountain/Desert Policy Committee on May 15, 2009.

Responsible Staff: Ty Schuiling, Director of Planning and Programming

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 28

Date: July 1, 2009

Subject: Notice of Presidential Appointment to Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Transportation and Communications Committee (TCC)

Recommendation:* Note Presidential Appointment of Upland Mayor John Pomierski to fill a vacancy on the SCAG Transportation and Communications Committee.

Background: In accordance with SANBAG Policy 10001, the SANBAG President is authorized to appoint members of the Board of Directors to SCAG policy committees. All Presidential appointments are announced at the SANBAG Board of Directors meeting immediately following the appointments for the purpose of advising the Board of Directors of the status of SANBAG committee membership and representation.

Board President Gary Ovitt has appointed Mayor John Pomierski of Upland to the SCAG Transportation and Communications Committee.

With this appointment, there is still one remaining vacancy on the Transportation and Communications Committee and there is also still one vacancy each on the Community Economic and Human Development Committee and the Energy and Environment Committee. Any Board Members that are interested in serving on these committees should contact the Board President or SANBAG staff.

The item serves to comply with SANBAG policy relative to announcement of appointments.

*

Approved
Board of Directors

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

Financial Impact: This item has no direct impact upon the adopted SANBAG budget.

Reviewed By: This item has not received prior policy committee review.

Responsible Staff: Duane A. Baker, Director of Management Services

-
- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
-

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 29

Date: July 1, 2009

Subject: Local Stimulus Program

Recommendation:* Approve a Local Stimulus Program that distributes \$31.4 million to the County and the cities as outlined in the Recommended Funding Option below and further defined in Exhibit A and B.

Background: In April 2009, the SANBAG Board of Directors gave direction to develop options for a Local Stimulus Program in exchange for maximizing American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds on the I-215 project. It was further directed that any program meet the intent of the California State legislation that distributed ARRA funds. That legislation states:

"It is the intent of the Legislature that at least 40 percent of the funds apportioned to a metropolitan planning organization, county transportation commission, or regional transportation planning agency be available for suballocation by that entity to a city, county, or city and county for projects that meet the requirements of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and this chapter."

While the legislation includes this intent, it does not make the 40% a requirement. This was done to allow flexibility in designing implementation plans because it is clear that not every jurisdiction has the ability to meet all of the federal guidelines attached to ARRA funds.

Approved
Board of Directors

Date: July 1, 2009

Moved: _____ Second: _____

In Favor: _____ Opposed: _____ Abstained: _____

Witnessed: _____

This Local Stimulus Program was approved by the Major Projects and Mountain/Desert Committees based on the feedback already received from those committees as well as from the CTP Technical Advisory Committee.

This proposed Local Stimulus Program will pass funds to local agencies in an amount equivalent to 40% of the ARRA funds SANBAG received under the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) distribution formula as cited in AB 3x 20. Under that formula, SANBAG is receiving \$2.05 million for areas with less than 5,000 population (ARRA Rural) and \$76.45 million for areas over 5,000 population (ARRA Urban) for a grand total of \$78.5 million. It should be noted that this total amount excludes \$2.4 million in Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds that would not be applicable to roadway construction and are being applied directly to qualifying regional projects. However, these amounts have been adjusted slightly by trading \$818,000 in ARRA Rural funds to the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) where they have eligible rural projects, in exchange for \$818,000 in ARRA Urban funds that were required for I-215. The new total is then \$1.2 million in ARRA Rural funds and \$77.3 million in ARRA Urban funds for a grand total of ARRA construction funds that remains the same at \$78.5 million. The 40% share of \$78.5 million is \$31.4 million.

Funding Source for Local Stimulus Program

As SANBAG does not have \$31.4 million in unallocated funds currently available to fund the Local Stimulus Program, staff has had to analyze potential pools of money for this program. One confirmed source and three possible sources of funds became apparent.

1. \$1.2 million remaining of the original \$2.05 million ARRA Rural funds is confirmed and will be allocated to the County for eligible projects in areas of less than 5,000 population. These ARRA Rural funds can't be used on I-215 and are thus available for obligation through the Caltrans Local Assistance process for the Local Stimulus Program. The County and several members of the Mountain/Desert Committee expressed concern over how this source of funds was allocated. The County made the case that the ARRA Rural funds can't be used for other areas precisely because it was recognized that rural areas need dedicated sources of funding because they have no inherent population base for a per capita distribution yet are used by the entire region and are an important component of our regional transportation network. The County felt that the full

\$2.05 million originally allocated for rural areas should be targeted to rural areas separately and should not be counted against the more urban areas of the County. The concept of adopting the intent of allocating the ARRA Rural funds separately to rural areas was endorsed by the CTP Technical Advisory Committee.

2. \$10 million in the current Measure I Major Projects fund balance is immediately available for allocation to the Local Stimulus Program. This would still leave an appropriate fund balance to cover other Valley major projects and any contingencies on Measure I funded projects.
3. Measure I Major Projects funds currently allocated to projects that will not be needed immediately. Some of this money could be used for a Local Stimulus Program but it would need to be replaced before it is needed for the construction of the projects to which it is allocated. Examples of the projects that don't need Measure I funds immediately are I-215 landscaping and I-210/Pepper ramps. It is anticipated that cost savings that may result from the I-215 construction, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) allocations freed up because ARRA funds were used instead, Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA), and State/Local Partnership Program (SLPP) could replace the rest of the funds. These sources of replacement funds, however, are not guaranteed which places some of SANBAG's major projects at risk. If the expected construction savings don't materialize or if state funding is substantially delayed or eliminated then approved projects could be impacted and delayed. There is also the risk of losing the flexibility of moving Measure I funds to projects that may experience shortfalls due to the state budget crisis. An example of a project at risk due to this is the I-10 Westbound from Live Oak to Ford Street which relies on CMIA funds that require the state to sell bonds.
4. State/Local Partnership Program (SLPP) funds approved as part of Proposition 1B. This source of funds is equal to approximately \$10 million per year over the next five years. Using funds from the SLPP brings some restrictions. The first restriction is that SLPP funds must be matched on a one to one basis by revenues from any voter-approved local or regional tax or fee solely dedicated to transportation improvements. In San Bernardino County, the only eligible local match is from Measure I. The second restriction is that projects receiving SLPP funds must be approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Also, only \$10 million a year is made available and so it

may take an additional year before the allocation sufficient for our needs would be available. Finally, the SLPP funds will come from Proposition 1B bonds that need to be sold by the State of California and there is no set date when that may happen.

Knowing these restrictions, staff originally examined two possible scenarios for funding the Local Stimulus Program. After receiving comments from committees and technical staff, a third scenario was added. Presented below is the recommended option based on committee feedback followed by the options originally presented to the committees.

Recommended Funding Option

This funding scenario recognizes the concerns raised during the committee meetings and provides for full funding of the 40% Local Stimulus Program. This option recognizes that all of the funds will not be available immediately and that the full amount would have to be distributed in two installments. The first installment equaling about 2/3 of the Local Stimulus Program would be available in September 2009 and the remaining 1/3 would be available as soon as SANBAG can free up the funds either by demonstrated savings on the I-215 project once bids have been awarded or by receipt of other funds from the state or federal government. Staff proposes coming back to the Board of Directors at the January 2010 Board meeting with a recommendation for a specific date on which to make the second installment of funds available. By January 2010, the results of the I-215 bids will be known as well as the status of other possible funding sources. At the time the Board would have the information necessary to make an informed decision based on funds available and projects that could be affected.

1. \$1.2 million from ARRA Rural
2. \$10 million from Measure I fund balance
3. \$10.54 million from Measure I committed to current projects
4. \$9.66 million from Measure I after savings or reimbursement

TOTAL: \$31.4 million total Local Stimulus Program

Original Funding Option 1

This scenario involves Measure I fund balance, ARRA Rural, Measure I Major Projects and SLPP funds. In this scenario both SANBAG and local agencies share the risk if there are any delays in the state funding the SLPP. The ARRA Rural and Measure I funds would be available immediately and the

SLPP funds are expected next year, though there is no guarantee. The funding for this scenario breaks down as follows:

1. \$1.2 million from ARRA Rural
2. \$10 million from Measure I fund balance
3. \$5.1 million from Measure I Major Projects committed to current projects
4. \$15.1 from SLPP

TOTAL: \$31.4 million total Local Stimulus Program

During the committee meetings this option was not a favored option. The main reason for this was skepticism over the timely availability of SLPP funds that rely on the State selling bonds. Committee members expressed concern over any option that involved significant state funding.

Original Funding Option 2

This funding scenario involves using ARRA Rural funds with the balance of the Local Stimulus Program coming from Measure I fund balance and Measure I Major Project funds committed but not immediately needed for construction. It is further proposed that this scenario apply a discount to the Measure I funds to recognize the risk to SANBAG major projects and the benefit local agencies will receive due to reduced costs because of significantly reduced regulatory requirements. By using Measure I funds, local agencies will get the benefit of a clean source of money to use on local priorities without having first to obtain approval from the CTC, Caltrans or to comply with federal environmental guidelines. These funds are also available immediately. Recognizing the benefits of clean money versus money with many regulations attached, it is a common practice to apply a discount in a range of 25% to 33%. In this scenario, SANBAG is proposing a 15% discount on the Measure I funds. This discount recognizes the risk that regional project funding faces and provides a nearly equivalent amount of actual construction funds to local agencies compared to if they had to comply with more stringent state and federal guidelines if they weren't receiving Measure I funds and instead were receiving ARRA funds or other state funds directly.

The funding breaks down as follows:

1. \$1.2 million from ARRA Rural
2. \$25.67 million from Measure I fund balance and current projects

TOTAL: \$26.87 million total Local Stimulus Program

During the committee meetings, there was much discussion of the concept of using a discount. During the Major Projects Committee meeting, some members were not as concerned about using a discount if they had a guaranteed source of money now. Some members of Major Projects and almost all of the Mountain/Desert Committee members did not like the concept of using a discount. These members felt that the legislative intent was clear and that local agencies should get full benefit of a Local Stimulus Program. Some agencies also stated that one of the reasons for using a discount, namely saving agencies from having to comply with federal requirements, did not hold true for them as they had federally approved or exempt projects on which to place federal stimulus funds. For many agencies, an option that included a discount was not the preferred alternative.

Distribution Formula

SANBAG staff originally examined two primary alternatives for distributing the Local Stimulus Program funds. The first alternative, which staff does not recommend, is to use the formula that is currently used to determine the Measure I local pass through. That formula is based partly on population and partly on sales tax generation. Staff does not recommend this approach because the Local Stimulus Program, unlike Measure I, has no component of sales tax revenue. Therefore, sales tax generation has no bearing on the amount of revenue that should be allocated to an agency. The committees concurred with staff's analysis and this alternative was dropped.

The second alternative is a distribution formula for the Local Stimulus Program based on a per capita basis, excepting that no agency would receive less than a set minimum. This distribution formula is straight forward and allows a minimum floor so that even agencies with a small population would be able to complete some meaningful work on their transportation system. If the minimum floor were not part of the formula, some agencies would receive so little money as to make it impossible to complete any meaningful work. The committees were all supportive of the minimum floor though there was some discussion at the CTP Technical Advisory Committee over what amount the minimum should be set. The original proposal was for a \$200,000 minimum and a proposal was made to increase that to \$300,000. During discussions at the committees, it was decided unanimously to set the minimum at \$300,000. It was further decided that the \$300,000 would be allocated in two installment like the regular per capita allocations. The \$300,000 minimum would be allocated with \$200,000 in the first installment and \$100,000 in the second installment.

Another distribution alternative was proposed as the draft was discussed in the committees. This alternative would be to segregate the \$2.05 million originally distributed to SANBAG for rural areas under 5,000 in population. In this alternative those rural funds would go to the County for projects in rural areas. That amount would be subtracted from the total and the rural populations in the county would be subtracted from the total population and the balance would be distributed on a per capita basis. This alternative became the basis for the staff recommendation. This distribution formula would work as follows:

1. Subtract \$2.05 million for rural areas from the \$31.4 million total amount available to arrive at \$29.35 million to be distributed to non-rural areas.
2. Divide \$29.35 million by the total county population less the rural area populations to arrive at a per capita amount to be distributed to the non-rural areas of the County and the cities.
3. This amount will then be multiplied by the population of each city and the non-rural unincorporated areas of the county to arrive at the per capita share for each agency.
4. The population figure used will be the State Department of Finance population estimate for January 1, 2009.
5. SANBAG will then evaluate the per capita shares of each agency and identify each agency that would receive less than the minimum amount (Grand Terrace, Big Bear Lake, Needles).
6. SANBAG will then allocate the minimum \$300,000 towards each of those agencies and subtract that amount from the total amount of non-rural Local Stimulus Funds available.
7. A second calculation will be done to establish the new per capita shares for the remaining agencies by taking the new amount available and dividing that by the total non-rural county population less the population of the agencies receiving the minimum.
8. This new per capita amount will then be multiplied by the population of the remaining agencies to establish a new agency share (see Exhibit A).

The attached Exhibit A is a table that shows the amount that each agency would receive under the recommended distribution formula described above. Also attached is Exhibit B which shows the procedures that would be used to administer the Local Stimulus Program under the recommended option. Exhibit C shows the procedures that were proposed to be used with the funding options originally presented to the committees in May 2009. Exhibit D is a table showing the amount each agency would receive under the option that is partially funded by SLPP funds and Exhibit E is a table showing the amounts each agency would be eligible to receive under the option that discounts the Measure I funds used for the program. Exhibit F is a copy of the CTC guidelines for the SLPP.

Financial Impact: This item would allocate \$1.2 million from the ARRA Rural funds to the County for rural projects. In addition, this item would allocate \$10 million from Measure I Major Projects fund balance and \$10.54 million from Measure I Major Projects in Fiscal Year 2009/2010. An additional \$9.66 million would be allocated from Measure I Major Projects on a date directed by the Board of Directors following a review at the January 2010 Board meeting.

Reviewed By: This item was reviewed and approved by the Major Projects Committee on June 11, 2009 and the Mountain/Desert Committee on June 19, 2009.

Responsible Staff: Duane A. Baker, Director of Management Services

Exhibit A

LOCAL STIMULUS PROGRAM DISTRIBUTION FORMULA OPTIONS

		\$2.05 million Rural funds separate			
		1st Installment		2nd Installment	
		\$ 19,664,500.00		\$ 9,685,500.00	
City	Population	Per Capita Only	\$300,000 min.	Per Capita Only	\$300,000 min.
WEST VALLEY					
CHINO	84,173	\$814,786.06	\$789,581.13	\$401,312.54	\$393,636.75
CHINO HILLS	78,725	\$762,049.98	\$747,829.17	\$375,338.05	\$368,188.13
FONTANA	189,021	\$1,829,704.02	\$1,786,659.45	\$901,197.50	\$883,958.31
MONTCLAIR	36,964	\$357,807.75	\$351,130.61	\$176,233.67	\$172,862.46
ONTARIO	173,188	\$1,676,442.19	\$1,645,167.68	\$825,710.33	\$809,915.15
RANCHO CUCAMONGA	177,736	\$1,720,466.37	\$1,688,380.31	\$847,393.88	\$831,183.91
UPLAND	75,035	\$726,331.15	\$712,778.90	\$357,745.19	\$350,801.81
TOTAL WEST VALLEY	814,842	\$7,887,587.51	\$7,740,395.26	\$3,884,931.16	\$3,810,815.53
EAST VALLEY					
COLTON	51,684	\$500,295.85	\$490,859.71	\$246,414.38	\$241,700.66
GRAND TERRACE	12,484	\$120,843.85	\$200,000.00	\$59,520.10	\$100,000.00
HIGHLAND	52,372	\$506,955.62	\$497,495.20	\$249,694.56	\$244,918.10
LOMA LINDA	22,619	\$218,949.61	\$214,863.74	\$107,840.86	\$105,777.95
REDLANDS	71,646	\$693,525.98	\$680,683.92	\$341,587.42	\$335,063.13
RIALTO	100,022	\$968,202.77	\$950,134.89	\$476,875.99	\$467,753.73
SAN BERNARDINO	204,483	\$1,979,374.60	\$1,942,436.89	\$974,915.85	\$956,286.48
YUCAIPA	51,317	\$496,743.33	\$487,473.48	\$244,664.63	\$239,984.39
TOTAL EAST VALLEY	566,627	\$5,484,891.61	\$5,468,947.92	\$2,701,513.78	\$2,681,454.44
TOTAL VALLEY	1,381,469	\$13,372,479.12	\$13,209,343.18	\$6,586,444.94	\$6,502,269.97
MOUNTAINS					
BIG BEAR LAKE	6,255	\$60,547.76	\$280,000.00	\$29,822.03	\$100,000.00
TOTAL MOUNTAINS	6,255	\$60,547.76	\$280,000.00	\$29,822.03	\$100,000.00
NORTH DESERT					
BARSTOW	24,213	\$234,379.37	\$230,005.58	\$115,440.59	\$113,232.30
TOTAL NORTH DESERT	24,213	\$234,379.37	\$230,005.58	\$115,440.59	\$113,232.30
COLORADO RIVER					
NEEDLES	5,793	\$56,075.65	\$280,000.00	\$27,619.35	\$100,000.00
TOTAL COLORADO RIVER	5,793	\$56,075.65	\$280,000.00	\$27,619.35	\$100,000.00
MORONGO BASIN					
TWENTYNINE PALMS	30,832	\$298,450.62	\$292,881.15	\$146,998.07	\$144,186.11
YUCCA VALLEY	21,239	\$205,591.36	\$201,754.76	\$101,261.41	\$99,824.36
TOTAL MORONGO BASIN	52,071	\$504,041.97	\$494,635.92	\$248,259.48	\$243,910.47
VICTOR VALLEY					
ADELANTO	28,265	\$273,602.32	\$268,498.58	\$134,759.35	\$132,181.61
APPLE VALLEY	69,861	\$676,247.36	\$663,827.74	\$333,077.06	\$326,705.56
HESPERIA	88,184	\$853,612.13	\$837,682.68	\$420,435.83	\$412,393.22
VICTORVILLE	109,441	\$1,059,377.73	\$1,035,808.41	\$521,783.06	\$511,804.77
TOTAL VICTOR VALLEY	295,751	\$2,862,839.54	\$2,809,418.37	\$1,410,055.29	\$1,383,082.06
TOTAL MOUNTAIN/DESERT	384,083	\$3,717,884.30	\$3,934,056.85	\$1,831,196.74	\$1,939,824.83
SUMMARY:					
TOTAL UNINCORPORATED URBAN & > 5,000	265,926	\$2,574,136.58	\$2,526,999.97	\$1,267,858.31	\$1,243,605.20
TOTAL UNINCORPORATED RURAL < 5,000	29,472	\$2,050,000.00	\$2,050,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL INCORPORATED	1,765,552	\$17,090,363.42	\$17,138,400.93	\$8,417,641.69	\$8,441,894.80
GRAND TOTAL	2,060,950	\$21,714,500.00	\$21,714,500.00	\$9,685,500.00	\$9,685,500.00

(1) - CITY FIGURES FROM DOF JANUARY 1, 2009 ESTIMATES

(2) - Scenarios show cities that receive less than \$300k per capita getting \$300k minimum and the balance being distributed per capita.

(3) - Unincorporated County areas are counted together as a whole and not subject to \$300k minimum.

Exhibit B

Program Procedures for Recommended Funding Option

Listed below are the draft procedures that would be used to administer the Local Stimulus Program as recommended.

Procedures for Recommended Option

1. SANBAG will notify each agency of its total allocation. This amount will be based on a per capita basis, excepting that no agency will receive less than \$300,000. SANBAG will determine the amount each agency will receive using the following procedure:
 - a. The \$31.4 million total amount available will be segregated with \$2.05 million designated for rural areas (less than 5,000 population) and \$29.35 million designated for non-rural areas. The \$29.35 million will be multiplied by 2/3 to arrive at the amount of non-rural funding available in 2009 (\$19.66 million). The \$19.66 million for non-rural areas will then be divided by the total county population less the total rural area population to arrive at a per capita amount.
 - b. This amount will then be multiplied by the population of each city and the non-rural unincorporated areas of the county to arrive at the per capita share for each agency.
 - c. The population figure used will be the State Department of Finance population estimate for January 1, 2009.
 - d. SANBAG will then evaluate the per capita shares of the total \$31.4 million available for each agency and identify each agency that would receive less than \$300,000 (Grand Terrace, Big Bear Lake, Needles).
 - e. SANBAG will then allocate \$200,000 towards each of those agencies and subtract that amount (\$600,000) from the \$19.66 million of Local Stimulus Funds available in 2009.
 - f. A second calculation will be done to establish the new per capita shares for the remaining agencies by taking the new amount available and dividing that by the total non-rural county population less the population of the agencies receiving the \$200,000 minimum.
 - g. This new per capita amount will then be multiplied by the population of the remaining agencies to establish a new agency share.
2. A total of \$2.05 million will be made available to the County specifically for projects in the rural areas. The \$1.2 million ARRA Rural allocation is counted against the County's total \$2.05 million rural allocation and projects funded by these ARRA Rural funds will follow the guidelines established by Caltrans for managing ARRA funds.
3. A second allocation of funds will be made available to agencies equaling the remaining 1/3 of the \$29.35 million total of non-rural funds or \$9.69 million.
4. This second allocation of \$9.69 million will be distributed using the following procedure:

Exhibit B

- a. The \$9.69 million will be divided by the total population of the County less the rural areas and the cities that received the \$200,000 minimum in the first allocation to arrive at a per capita amount.
 - b. SANBAG will then allocate \$100,000 towards each of those agencies and subtract that amount (\$300,000) from the \$9.69 million of Local Stimulus Funds available in 2009.
 - c. A second calculation will be done to establish the new per capita shares for the remaining agencies by taking the new amount available and dividing that by the total non-rural county population less the population of the agencies receiving the minimum.
 - d. This new per capita amount will then be multiplied by the population of the remaining agencies to establish a new agency share.
5. The second allocation of funds will be made available on a date approved by the Board of Directors at their January 2010 meeting.
6. Agencies will submit Local Stimulus Program projects to SANBAG on a form approved by SANBAG which will include:
 - a. Project name and description.
 - b. Either the actual number of jobs created by the project or an estimate of the number of jobs that will be created by the project (SANBAG will provide guidance on how to calculate this number).
 - c. Total project cost and designation of all funds to demonstrate that the project is fully funded.
 - d. Estimated project start and completion dates.
 - e. Useful life of the project.
7. Projects submitted must be one of the following:
 - a. Major rehabilitation, resurfacing or reconstruction extending road life by 15 years.
 - b. New construction to increase capacity, improve mobility or enhance safety.
 - c. Improvements to bicycle or pedestrian safety or mobility with a useful life of at least 15 years.
 - d. Environmental mitigation for air or water quality impacts identified in the environmental impact report for a transportation project.
8. Projects can be submitted to SANBAG beginning September 1, 2009 and will be accepted until three months after the date that the second allocation is made available.
9. Once the project has been reviewed and approved by SANBAG staff for compliance, the Executive Director will issue a Local Stimulus Program Allocation Letter for each project.
10. Local agencies may access available Local Stimulus Program funds by submitting project expenditure invoices to SANBAG.
 - a. Invoices may be submitted as frequently as monthly or upon completion of the project.
 - b. Local agencies shall provide adequate documentation to substantiate the costs included in the invoice. At a minimum, the jurisdiction must submit the invoice provided by the contractor/consultant, which shall include unit costs, quantities, labor rates, and other

Exhibit B

documentation, as appropriate, to substantiate expenses incurred by the contractor/consultant.

- c. SANBAG shall reimburse local agencies for eligible expenditures within 30 days of receiving a complete and satisfactory invoice package, which shall include all backup and support materials required to substantiate the expenditures.
11. Agencies will have 36 months from the date that SANBAG issues the Local Stimulus Program Allocation Letter to complete the project and request reimbursement
 12. SANBAG will complete a semiannual report and a final project report to the Board.

Exhibit C

Program Procedures for Original Funding Options

Listed below are the draft procedures that would be used to administer the Local Stimulus Program under the two original funding options presented to the committees.

Procedures for Original Funding Option 1&2

1. SANBAG will notify each agency of its total allocation. This amount will be based on a per capita basis, excepting that no agency will receive less than \$200,000. SANBAG will determine the amount each agency will receive using the following procedure:
 - a. The total amount available will be divided by the total county population to arrive at a per capita amount.
 - b. This amount will then be multiplied by the population of each city and the unincorporated areas of the county to arrive at the per capita share for each agency.
 - c. The population figure used will be the State Department of Finance population estimate for January 1, 2009.
 - d. SANBAG will then evaluate the per capita shares of each agency and identify each agency that would receive less than \$200,000 (Grand Terrace, Big Bear Lake, Needles).
 - e. SANBAG will then allocate \$200,000 towards each of those agencies and subtract that amount from the total amount of Local Stimulus Funds available.
 - f. A second calculation will be done to establish the new per capita shares for the remaining agencies by taking the new amount available and dividing that by the total county population less the population of the agencies receiving the \$200,000 minimum.
 - g. This new per capita amount will then be multiplied by the population of the remaining agencies to establish a new agency share (see Exhibits D and E).
2. The \$1.2 million ARRA Rural allocation is counted against the County's total allocation and projects funded by these funds will follow the guidelines established by Caltrans for managing ARRA funds.
3. Agencies will submit Local Stimulus Program projects to SANBAG on a form approved by SANBAG which will include:
 - a. Project name and description.
 - b. Either the actual number of jobs created by the project or an estimate of the number of jobs that will be created by the project (SANBAG will provide guidance on how to calculate this number).
 - c. Total project cost and designation of all funds to demonstrate that the project is fully funded.
 - d. Estimated project start and completion dates.
 - e. Useful life of the project.
4. Projects submitted must be one of the following:
 - a. Major rehabilitation, resurfacing or reconstruction extending road life by 15 years.

Exhibit C

- b. New construction to increase capacity, improve mobility or enhance safety.
- c. Improvements to bicycle or pedestrian safety or mobility with a useful life of at least 15 years.
- d. Environmental mitigation for air or water quality impacts identified in the environmental impact report for a transportation project.

Procedures Specific to Original Funding Option 1 (SLPP and Measure I)

1. Projects will be submitted to SANBAG by February 1, 2010
2. As some of the Local Stimulus Program funds are coming from the SLPP there is a requirement for a 1:1 match of Measure I funds to SLPP.
 - a. Funds other than Measure I can't be used for the local match.
 - b. The Measure I funds received as part of this Local Stimulus Program will be the local match.
3. SANBAG will review projects for compliance and compile into the SLPP application (the same as the Project Programming Request form used for STIP).
4. Projects funded through SLPP must also meet the requirements of the SLPP as approved by the California Transportation Commission on December 11, 2008 (see Exhibit E).
5. The Executive Director will issue a Local Stimulus Program Allocation Letter for each project indicating the Measure I allocation for each project no later than July 1, 2010.
6. SANBAG will take the SLPP project application and a resolution committing the Measure I portion of the Local Stimulus Program funds to the Board for approval no later than the July 2010 Board meeting.
7. SANBAG will submit the SLPP project application to the CTC by August 15, 2010.
8. Allocation of SLPP funds will work same as STIP process.
 - a. Funds must be used within six months of allocation.
 - b. Local agencies may access available SLPP funds by submitting project expenditure invoices to Caltrans using the same procedure as is used for the STIP.
9. Local agencies may access their Measure I Local Stimulus Program funds for their local match of the SLPP by submitting a copy of the projects expenditure invoices to SANBAG.
 - a. SANBAG shall reimburse local agencies for eligible expenditures within 30 days of receiving a complete and satisfactory invoice package, which shall include all backup and support materials required to substantiate the expenditures.
 - b. Invoices may be submitted as frequently as monthly.
10. SANBAG will complete a semiannual report and a final project report to the Board and to the CTC.

Procedures Specific to Original Funding Option 2 (Measure I)

1. Projects will be submitted to SANBAG by September 1, 2009
2. Once the project has been reviewed and approved by SANBAG staff for compliance, the Executive Director will issue a Local Stimulus Program Allocation Letter for each project.

BRD0907b-DAB
60109000

Exhibit C

3. Local agencies may access available Local Stimulus Program funds by submitting project expenditure invoices to SANBAG.
 - a. Invoices may be submitted as frequently as monthly or upon completion of the project.
 - b. Local agencies shall provide adequate documentation to substantiate the costs included in the invoice. At a minimum, the jurisdiction must submit the invoice provided by the contractor/consultant, which shall include unit costs, quantities, labor rates, and other documentation, as appropriate, to substantiate expenses incurred by the contractor/consultant.
 - c. SANBAG shall reimburse local agencies for eligible expenditures within 30 days of receiving a complete and satisfactory invoice package, which shall include all backup and support materials required to substantiate the expenditures.
4. Agencies will have 36 months to complete projects and request reimbursement
5. SANBAG will complete a semiannual report and a final project report to the Board.

Exhibit D

LOCAL STIMULUS PROGRAM DISTRIBUTION FORMULA OPTIONS

Local Funds and State SLPP Match

City	Population	Local Funds		SLPP		Total	
		\$	Per Capita Only	\$	Per Capita Only	\$	Per Capita Only
		\$200,000 min.	\$300,000 min.	\$200,000 min.	\$300,000 min.	\$200,000 min.	\$300,000 min.
WEST VALLEY							
CHINO	84,173	\$665,722.07	\$665,722.07	\$624,141.16	\$624,141.16	\$1,289,863.23	\$1,289,863.23
CHINO HILLS	78,725	\$622,633.98	\$622,633.98	\$583,744.35	\$583,744.35	\$1,206,378.33	\$1,206,378.33
FONTANA	189,021	\$1,428,862.18	\$1,428,862.18	\$1,301,087.34	\$1,301,087.34	\$2,730,949.52	\$2,730,949.52
MONTCLAIR	36,864	\$292,347.32	\$292,347.32	\$274,087.34	\$274,087.34	\$566,434.66	\$566,434.66
ONTARIO	173,188	\$1,369,739.39	\$1,369,739.39	\$1,284,188.68	\$1,284,188.68	\$2,653,928.07	\$2,653,928.07
RANCHO CUCAMONGA	177,736	\$1,405,709.41	\$1,405,709.41	\$1,317,009.00	\$1,317,009.00	\$2,722,718.41	\$2,722,718.41
UPLAND	75,035	\$593,448.87	\$593,448.87	\$556,383.07	\$556,383.07	\$1,149,831.94	\$1,149,831.94
TOTAL WEST VALLEY	814,842	\$6,444,564.31	\$6,444,564.31	\$6,042,037.84	\$6,042,037.84	\$12,486,602.15	\$12,486,602.15
EAST VALLEY							
COLTON	51,584	\$408,767.41	\$408,767.41	\$383,236.86	\$383,236.86	\$792,004.27	\$792,004.27
GRAND TERRACE	12,484	\$96,735.43	\$96,735.43	\$90,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$186,735.43	\$186,735.43
HIGHLAND	52,372	\$414,208.79	\$414,208.79	\$388,337.36	\$388,337.36	\$802,546.15	\$802,546.15
LOMA LINDA	22,819	\$178,983.08	\$178,983.08	\$167,719.45	\$167,719.45	\$346,702.53	\$346,702.53
REDLANDS	71,846	\$566,648.38	\$566,648.38	\$531,253.70	\$531,253.70	\$1,097,902.08	\$1,097,902.08
RIALTO	100,022	\$791,071.40	\$791,071.40	\$741,661.19	\$741,661.19	\$1,532,732.59	\$1,532,732.59
SAN BERNARDINO	204,483	\$1,617,260.73	\$1,617,260.73	\$1,516,237.48	\$1,516,237.48	\$3,133,498.21	\$3,133,498.21
YUCAIPA	51,317	\$405,864.82	\$405,864.82	\$380,514.56	\$380,514.56	\$786,379.38	\$786,379.38
TOTAL EAST VALLEY	666,027	\$4,487,439.22	\$4,487,439.22	\$4,108,989.60	\$4,108,989.60	\$8,596,428.82	\$8,596,428.82
MOUNTAINS							
BIG BEAR LAKE	6,255	\$49,470.63	\$49,470.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$49,470.63	\$49,470.63
TOTAL MOUNTAINS	6,255	\$49,470.63	\$49,470.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$49,470.63	\$49,470.63
NORTH DESERT							
BARSTOW	24,213	\$191,489.09	\$191,489.09	\$179,538.93	\$179,538.93	\$371,028.02	\$371,028.02
TOTAL NORTH DESERT	24,213	\$191,489.09	\$191,489.09	\$179,538.93	\$179,538.93	\$371,028.02	\$371,028.02
COLORADO RIVER							
NEEDLES	5,793	\$45,516.69	\$45,516.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,516.69	\$45,516.69
TOTAL COLORADO RIVER	5,793	\$45,516.69	\$45,516.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,516.69	\$45,516.69
MORONGO BASIN							
TWENTYNINE PALMS	30,832	\$243,849.49	\$243,849.49	\$228,618.68	\$228,618.68	\$472,468.17	\$472,468.17
YUCCA VALLEY	21,239	\$167,876.70	\$167,876.70	\$157,486.77	\$157,486.77	\$325,363.47	\$325,363.47
TOTAL MORONGO BASIN	52,071	\$411,726.19	\$411,726.19	\$386,105.45	\$386,105.45	\$797,831.64	\$797,831.64
VICTOR VALLEY							
ADELANTO	28,285	\$223,047.16	\$223,047.16	\$209,584.43	\$209,584.43	\$432,631.59	\$432,631.59
APPLE VALLEY	69,881	\$552,528.63	\$552,528.63	\$518,017.96	\$518,017.96	\$1,070,546.59	\$1,070,546.59
HESPERIA	88,184	\$697,444.06	\$697,444.06	\$653,892.65	\$653,892.65	\$1,351,336.71	\$1,351,336.71
VICTORVILLE	109,441	\$865,568.03	\$865,568.03	\$811,502.89	\$811,502.89	\$1,677,070.92	\$1,677,070.92
TOTAL VICTOR VALLEY	296,751	\$2,339,086.97	\$2,339,086.97	\$2,192,997.93	\$2,192,997.93	\$4,532,084.90	\$4,532,084.90
TOTAL MOUNTAIN DESERT							
SUMMARY:	384,083	\$3,037,022.47	\$3,037,022.47	\$2,798,622.31	\$2,798,622.31	\$5,835,644.78	\$5,835,644.78
TOTAL UNINCORPORATED URBAN & > 5,000							
TOTAL UNINCORPORATED URBAN & > 5,000	265,926	\$2,103,201.82	\$2,103,201.82	\$1,971,836.14	\$1,971,836.14	\$4,075,037.96	\$4,075,037.96
TOTAL UNINCORPORATED RURAL < 5,000							
TOTAL UNINCORPORATED RURAL < 5,000	29,472	\$233,093.28	\$233,093.28	\$218,934.31	\$218,934.31	\$452,027.59	\$452,027.59
TOTAL INCORPORATED							
TOTAL INCORPORATED	1,765,552	\$13,953,704.89	\$13,953,704.89	\$12,935,702.08	\$12,935,702.08	\$26,889,406.97	\$26,889,406.97
GRAND TOTAL	2,060,960	\$16,300,000.00	\$16,300,000.00	\$15,100,000.00	\$15,100,000.00	\$31,400,000.00	\$31,400,000.00

- (1) - CITY FIGURES FROM DOF JANUARY 1, 2009 ESTIMATES
- (2) - Scenarios show cities that receive less than \$200k per capita getting \$200k minimum and the balance being distributed per capita.
- (3) - Unincorporated County areas are counted together as a whole and not subject to \$200k

Exhibit E

LOCAL STIMULUS PROGRAM DISTRIBUTION FORMULA OPTIONS				
15% Discount				
		\$ 26,870,000.00		
City	Population	Per Capita Only	\$200,000 min.	\$300,000 min.
WEST VALLEY				
CHINO	84,173	\$1,097,420.37	\$1,085,540.29	\$1,071,721.31
CHINO HILLS	78,726	\$1,026,391.11	\$1,015,680.53	\$1,002,365.39
FONTANA	189,021	\$2,464,394.71	\$2,438,390.19	\$2,406,684.25
MONTCLAIR	36,964	\$481,924.69	\$476,839.32	\$470,639.12
ONTARIO	173,188	\$2,267,969.17	\$2,204,142.87	\$2,205,092.72
RANCHO CUCAMONGA	177,736	\$2,317,264.52	\$2,292,812.84	\$2,262,999.52
UPLAND	75,036	\$978,282.08	\$967,859.16	\$956,372.96
TOTAL WEST VALLEY	814,842	\$10,623,646.64	\$10,511,544.95	\$10,374,865.27
EAST VALLEY				
COLTON	51,684	\$673,839.29	\$666,728.87	\$658,069.52
GRAND TERRACE	12,484	\$162,762.36	\$200,000.00	\$300,000.00
HIGHLAND	62,372	\$682,809.21	\$678,804.14	\$666,819.39
LOMA LINDA	22,619	\$294,899.21	\$281,787.41	\$300,000.00
REDLANDS	71,646	\$934,097.39	\$924,245.71	\$912,222.98
RIALTO	100,022	\$1,304,054.51	\$1,280,284.01	\$1,273,616.55
SAN BERNARDINO	204,483	\$2,665,983.26	\$2,637,851.67	\$2,603,552.07
YUCAIPA	51,317	\$669,054.46	\$661,954.54	\$653,386.74
TOTAL EAST VALLEY	566,627	\$7,387,499.69	\$7,348,601.25	\$7,367,557.25
TOTAL VALLEY	1,381,469	\$18,011,146.33	\$17,860,146.19	\$17,742,422.52
MOUNTAINS				
BIG BEAR LAKE	6,256	\$81,550.67	\$200,000.00	\$300,000.00
TOTAL MOUNTAINS	6,256	\$81,550.67	\$200,000.00	\$300,000.00
NORTH DESERT				
BARSTOW	24,213	\$315,681.27	\$312,350.17	\$308,288.74
TOTAL NORTH DESERT	24,213	\$315,681.27	\$312,350.17	\$308,288.74
COLORADO RIVER				
NEEDLES	5,793	\$75,527.26	\$200,000.00	\$300,000.00
TOTAL COLORADO RIVER	5,793	\$75,527.26	\$200,000.00	\$300,000.00
MORONGO BASIN				
TWENTYNINE PALMS	30,832	\$401,977.66	\$397,736.95	\$392,564.26
YUCCA VALLEY	21,239	\$276,907.22	\$273,955.27	\$300,000.00
TOTAL MORONGO BASIN	52,071	\$678,884.87	\$671,692.21	\$692,564.26
VICTOR VALLEY				
ADELANTO	28,265	\$368,609.93	\$364,921.38	\$359,880.28
APPLE VALLEY	69,861	\$910,825.14	\$901,214.03	\$889,496.71
HESPERIA	88,184	\$1,149,714.49	\$1,137,682.60	\$1,122,790.82
VICTORVILLE	109,441	\$1,426,858.39	\$1,414,800.07	\$1,393,442.69
TOTAL VICTOR VALLEY	295,751	\$3,855,905.95	\$3,815,218.08	\$3,765,609.50
TOTAL MOUNTAIN/DESERT	384,083	\$ 5,007,550.92	\$ 5,199,289.48	\$ 5,366,462.50
SUMMARY:				
TOTAL UNINCORPORATED URBAN & > 5,000	265,926	\$3,467,057.24	\$3,439,472.64	\$3,385,866.73
TOTAL UNINCORPORATED RURAL < 5,000	29,472	\$384,246.41	\$380,191.81	\$375,248.24
TOTAL INCORPORATED	1,765,552	\$23,018,696.36	\$23,055,855.86	\$23,108,885.02
GRAND TOTAL	2,060,950	\$ 26,870,000.00	\$ 26,870,000.00	\$ 26,870,000.00
(1) - CITY FIGURES FROM DOF JANUARY 1, 2009 ESTIMATES				
(2) - Scenarios show cities that receive less than \$200k per capita getting \$200k minimum and the balance being distributed per capita.				
(3) - Unincorporated County areas are counted together as a whole and not subject to \$200k minimum.				

BRD0907b-DAB
60109000

Exhibit F

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION State-Local Partnership Program Guidelines Adopted December 11, 2008

General Program Policy

1. Authority and purpose of guidelines. The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, approved by the voters as Proposition 1B on November 7, 2006, authorized \$1 billion to be deposited in the State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) Account to be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for allocation by the California Transportation Commission over a five-year period to eligible transportation projects nominated by an applicant transportation agency. The Bond Act required a dollar for dollar match of local funds for an applicant agency to receive state funds under the program.

In 2008, the Legislature enacted implementing legislation (AB 268) to add Article 11 (commencing with Section 8879.66) to Chapter 12.491 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code. Article 11 defines the purpose and intent of the program, defines the eligibility of applicants, projects, and matching funds, and provides that 95% of program funds will be distributed by formula to match voter-approved transportation taxes and fees and that the remaining 5% will be available for a competitive grant application program to match uniform developer fees. Section 8879.74 requires the Commission to adopt an annual program of projects for the program and to develop and adopt guidelines to implement the program, consistent with Article 11. Initial project allocations are to be made by April 2009.

Earlier legislation to implement the Bond Act (SB 88, 2007) designated the Commission as the administrative agency for the SLPP and mandated that various administrative and reporting requirements be incorporated in the guidelines for all programs established by Proposition 1B.

2. Program of Projects. The Commission will adopt an annual program of projects for the SLPP, by April 2009 for 2008-09 and by October for each fiscal year thereafter. The program will consist of projects nominated by eligible applicants for the formula program and projects selected by the Commission under the competitive grant program to match uniform developer fees. SLPP project funding will match eligible local funding for project construction or equipment acquisition, consistent with Section 8879.70. The Commission will not program or allocate SLPP funding to match local funding for preconstruction work.

The program of projects for each fiscal year will include, for each project, the amount to be funded from the SLPP, the source of the dollar-for-dollar match of SLPP funding, and the estimated total cost of project construction or equipment acquisition, including any additional supplementary funding. The source of the dollar-for-dollar match will include only revenues from the transportation tax or fee that qualifies the applicant for SLPP funding and only funds to be expended after the Commission allocation of SLPP funds.

Exhibit F

The Commission will program and allocate funding to projects in whole thousands of dollars and will include a project only if it is fully funded from a combination of SLPP and other committed funding. The Commission will regard funds as committed when they are programmed by the Commission or when the agency with discretionary authority over the funds has made its commitment to the project by ordinance or resolution. For federal formula funds, including RSTP, CMAQ, and federal formula transit funds, the commitment may be by federal TIP adoption. For federal discretionary funds, the commitment may be by federal approval of a full funding grant agreement or by grant approval.

The Commission's annual SLPP program of projects will also include multiyear programs of projects for SLPP funding that eligible applicants may elect to adopt and submit to the Commission. The Commission will include these multiyear programs for informational purposes, acknowledging the future plans and intent of the eligible applicants. The inclusion of an applicant multiyear program, however, will not constitute a programming commitment by the Commission for future year funding.

Formula Program for Voter-Approved Taxes and Fees

3. **Annual Funding Shares.** The Commission will adopt the annual funding share for each eligible applicant for the Voter-Approved Taxes and Fees Subaccount with the adoption of these guidelines for 2008-09 and prior to the beginning of each subsequent fiscal year. These shares will be determined in accordance with Government Code Section 8879.72 and rounded to the nearest whole thousand dollars. In establishing funding shares, the Commission will use the following:
 - For toll revenues, the sum of revenues from Regional Measures 1 and 2 for the second prior fiscal year (e.g., 2006-07 data for 2008-09 funding shares), as reported in audited financial statements from the Bay Area Toll Authority.
 - For parcel and property tax revenues, the revenues for the second prior fiscal year (e.g., 2006-07 data for 2008-09 funding shares), as reported to the State Controller pursuant to Government Code Section 53891.
 - For local sales tax revenues, the sum of gross revenues for the most recent four quarters as reported for each local tax by the Board of Equalization.
 - For population, the annual population estimate for cities and counties issued by the Department of Finance in May prior to the beginning of each fiscal year.

The Commission will determine a funding share for each eligible applicant with a voter-approved tax or toll that was approved prior to the adoption of the funding shares and will be collected during the fiscal year. Where a city has a voter-approved local sales tax and is located within a county without a countywide sales tax, the Commission will adopt a funding share for the city based on the city's population. Where there are multiple eligible applicants with a voter-approved local sales tax within a county with a countywide sales tax, the Commission will adopt a single countywide funding share based on the population for the county.

Exhibit F

The Commission will set aside up to 2 percent of the total amount appropriated each year for the program as a reserve for bond administrative expenses. In the absence of an enacted state budget, the Commission may establish the funding shares based on its best estimate of the amount that the Legislature will appropriate to the SLPP Account, subject to adjustment based on the final appropriation in the Budget Act.

4. Project nominations. The Commission will include in the annual program of projects each project nominated by an eligible applicant for a formula funding share provided that the Commission finds that the nomination meets the requirements of statute and that the project has a commitment of the required match and any supplementary funding needed for full funding. Each applicant should submit its nomination by February 17, 2009 for 2008-09 and by August 15 for each fiscal year thereafter. The Commission's program of projects will not include a project nomination that exceeds the applicant's formula funding share. A nomination will include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the applicant's governing board. Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, the nomination will also include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other authorized officer of the implementing agency. The Commission requests that applicants for funding from a formula share submit three hard copies of each nomination. The nominations should be addressed or delivered to:

Bimla Rhinehart, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
Mail Station 52, Room 2231
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

A project nomination may be for supplemental funding of a project that was allocated SLPP funding in a prior year, provided that the supplemental SLPP funding and the match for that supplemental funding will not be expended until after the allocation of the supplemental funding. The supplemental SLPP funding may be to replace local funding already committed to the project, subject to the required one-to-one match.

For each nominated project, the applicant should submit project information using the Project Programming Request form in use for STIP projects. The nomination should identify the implementing agency, which may be different from the applicant agency. As specified in statute, the nomination shall include:

- A description of the nominated project, including its cost and scope and the specific improvements and benefits it is anticipated to serve. The description should identify the project's useful life.
- A description of the project's current status, including the current phase of delivery, and the schedule for the completion of construction or acquisition.
- A description of how the project would support transportation and land use planning goals within the region.
- The amount and source of matching funds.
- The amount of SLPP funds requested.

Exhibit F

An eligible applicant may adopt and submit a multiyear program for SLPP funding, either in addition to or in lieu of project nominations for the program year. As described in section 2, the Commission's acknowledgement of an applicant's multiyear program will not constitute a Commission programming commitment of future year SLPP funding.

5. Balance of funding share. If the program of projects adopted by the Commission does not program the full amount of an applicant's formula funding share, the balance will remain available for later program amendments supported by eligible project nominations. A balance not programmed in one fiscal year will carry over and be available in the following fiscal year.

Competitive Grant Program to Match Uniform Developer Fees

6. Project selection. The Commission will select projects from among eligible project nominations for the competitive grant program from the Uniform Developer Fees Subaccount pursuant to Government Code Section 8879.73. No single competitive grant for the SLPP may exceed \$1 million. The Commission will consider approval of a competitive grant only when it finds that the grant request meets the requirements of statute and that the project has a commitment of the required match and any supplementary funding needed for full funding. The selected projects will be included in the Commission's annual program of projects for the SLPP. The Commission will consider only projects for which five hard copies of a complete nomination are received in the Commission office by February 17, 2009 for 2008-09 and by August 15 for each fiscal year thereafter. A nomination will include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the applicant's governing board. Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, the nomination will also include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other authorized officer of the implementing agency. The nominations should be addressed or delivered to:

Bimla Rhinehart, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
Mail Station 52, Room 2231
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

7. Project applications. For each project nominated for the competitive grant program, the applicant should submit project information using the Project Programming Request form in use for STIP projects. The nomination should identify the implementing agency, which may be different from the applicant agency. As specified in statute, the nomination shall include:

Exhibit F

- A description of the nominated project, including its cost and scope and the specific improvements and benefits it is anticipated to serve. The description should identify the project's useful life.
- A description of the project's current status, including the current phase of delivery, and the schedule for the completion of construction or acquisition.
- A description of how the project would support transportation and land use planning goals within the region.
- The amount and source of matching funds.
- The amount of SLPP funds requested.

In addition, the grant request should include a copy of the ordinance or resolution adopted by a city, county or city and county that establishes the uniform developer fee to be matched by the grant.

An agency may apply for supplemental funding of up to \$1 million for a project that was allocated SLPP funding in a prior year or years, provided that the supplemental SLPP funding and the match for that supplemental funding will not be expended until after the allocation of the supplemental funding. The supplemental SLPP funding may be to replace local funding already committed to the project, subject to the required one-to-one match. Prior year funding of a project under the SLPP discretionary grant program is not a selection criterion for funding in a subsequent year. The Commission will evaluate applications competitively in each funding cycle.

8. Project selection criteria. In approving grants for inclusion in the program of projects, the Commission will give consideration to geographic balance and to demonstrated project cost-effectiveness. The Commission will give higher priority to projects that are more cost-effective, that can commence construction or implementation earlier, that leverage more uniform developer fees per program dollar, and that can demonstrate quantifiable air quality improvements, including a significant reduction in vehicle-miles traveled.
9. Balance of grant program funds. If the program of projects adopted by the Commission does not program the full amount of the share for the competitive grant program, the balance will remain available for later program amendments supported by eligible project grant requests. A balance not programmed in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for the competitive grant program in the following fiscal year.

Project Allocations and Delivery

10. Amendments to program of projects. The Commission may approve an amendment of the SLPP program of projects at any time. An amendment need only appear on the agenda published 10 days in advance of the Commission meeting. It does not require the 30-day notice that applies to a STIP amendment.
11. Allocations from the SLPP Account. The Commission will consider the allocation of funds from the SLPP Account for a project when it receives an allocation request and

Exhibit F

recommendation from the Department of Transportation; in the same manner as for the STIP (see section 64 of the STIP guidelines). The recommendation will include a determination of the availability of appropriated funding from the SLPP Account and the availability of all identified and committed matching and supplementary funding. The Commission will approve the allocation if the funds are available, the allocation is necessary to implement the project as included in the adopted SLPP program, and the project has the required environmental clearance.

12. Timely Use of Funds. Under statute, projects receiving an SLPP allocation shall encumber the funds no later than two years after the end of the fiscal year in which the Commission makes the allocation. Commission policy; however, is that SLPP allocations are valid for encumbrance for six months from the date of approval unless the Commission approves an extension. Applicants may submit and the Commission will evaluate extension requests in the same manner as for STIP projects (see section 66 of the STIP guidelines).
13. Semiannual delivery reports: As a condition of the project allocation, the Commission will require the implementing agency to submit semiannual reports on the activities and progress made toward implementation of the project. As mandated by Government Code Section 8879.50, the Commission shall forward these reports to the Department of Finance. The purpose of the reports is to ensure that the project is being executed in a timely fashion and is within the scope and budget identified when the decision was made to fund the project. If it is anticipated that project costs will exceed the approved project budget, the implementing agency shall provide a plan to the Commission for achieving the benefits of the project by either downscoping the project to remain within budget or by identifying an alternative funding source to meet the cost increase. The Commission may either approve the corrective plan or direct the implementing agency to modify its plan.
14. Final delivery report. Within six months of the project becoming operable, the implementing agency shall provide a final delivery report to the Commission on the scope of the completed project, its final costs as compared to the approved project budget, its duration as compared to the project schedule in the project baseline agreement, and performance outcomes derived from the project as compared to those described in the project baseline agreement. The Commission shall forward this report to the Department of Finance as required by Government Code Section 8879.50. For the purpose of this section, a project becomes operable when the construction contract is accepted or acquired equipment is received.
15. Audit of project expenditures and outcomes. The Department of Transportation will ensure that project expenditures and outcomes are audited. For each SLPP project, the Commission expects the Department to provide a semi-final audit report within 6 months after the final delivery report and a final audit report within 12 months after the final delivery report. The Commission may also require interim audits at any time during the performance of the project.

Exhibit F

Audits will be performed in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards promulgated by the United States Government Accountability Office. Audits will provide a finding on the following:

- Whether project costs incurred and reimbursed are in compliance with the executed project baseline agreement or approved amendments thereof; state and federal laws and regulations; contract provisions; and Commission guidelines.
- Whether project deliverables (outputs) and outcomes are consistent with the project scope, schedule and benefits described in the executed project baseline agreement or approved amendments thereof.

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 30

Date: July 1, 2009

Subject: Candidate Projects for Federal Recovery Act: Transportation Investment
Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary Program

Recommendation:* Approve the Interstate 10 Westbound Widening, Interstate 10 Auxiliary Lanes,
Hunts Lane and Monte Vista grade separations as SANBAG's potential
candidate projects for TIGER grant funds in partnership with Caltrans.

Background: SANBAG must submit candidate projects for the American Recovery and
Reinvestment Act (ARRA) \$1.5 billion of discretionary grant funds by a state-
imposed deadline of July 27, 2009. It is the Governor's intent to have one
application prepared for the State of California which will include all California
candidate projects. Staff seeks approval of a list of projects from which the most
competitive will be submitted for inclusion in the state submittal.

This potential funding is known as "Grants for Transportation Investment
Generating Economic Recovery" or "TIGER Discretionary Grants." The TIGER
Discretionary Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis to projects in
accordance with draft guidance circulated by the US Department of
Transportation on May 18, 2009, which calls for funding priority to be given to
nationally and regionally significant transportation projects for which construction
can be completed by February 17, 2012. A fact sheet for the criteria is included
as Attachment A. In addition, comments by Secretary of Transportation LaHood
and US Department of Transportation staff indicate that port and trade-related
projects will be given priority. The final statewide submittal to the US
Department of Transportation (DOT) is scheduled to occur on September 15,

*Approved
Board of Directors*

Date: _____

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

2009. The Act limited the amount of TIGER grant funds to be awarded to any state to \$300 million.

Staff from the stakeholder agencies of the Southern California Corridor Consensus Group have worked cooperatively to develop a comprehensive project list for the Southern California region. The agencies include SANBAG; Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC); the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA); the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA); the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC); the Ports of Los Angeles (POLA), Long Beach (POLB), and Hueneme; the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority (ACTA); the Alameda Corridor East Construction Authority (ACE); and the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA).

Based on the criteria outlined in the DOT's guidance and in consultation with Caltrans, SANBAG staff identified two projects on the I-10 corridor, a nationally and regionally significant goods-movement corridor and two grade-separation projects that can meet the criteria to provide both short-term and long-term benefits as intended in the Act. SANBAG staff recommends replacement of Measure I and State Transportation Improvement Programs (STIP) funds previously committed to the I-10 Westbound Widening and I-10 Auxiliary Lanes projects with TIGER funds, in the amount of \$14M. The Measure I and STIP funds could be re-programmed to the I-10/Cherry and I-10/Citrus Interchange projects. These two projects are partially funded with Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Funds (TCIF) matched by STIP, Measure I, and Local Development Impact Fee Funds. These projects were once considered fully funded, but are currently impacted by the economic downturn, leading to a potential shortfall in local contributions. This factor is expected to be given strong consideration by the state in its formulation of the TIGER submittal.

SANBAG staff also recommends TIGER Candidacy for two grade-separation projects along the Alameda Corridor East (ACE) in San Bernardino. The Hunts Lane and Monte Vista grade separation projects are funded with Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) and federal Projects of National and Regional Significance (PNRS) funds. If successful, the TIGER grant will offset \$21.8M of PNRS funds which can be re-programmed to other Alameda Corridor East grade separations.

More detailed information on these four projects is contained in Attachment B.

Financial Impact: Award of the requested TIGER funds would provide savings of Measure I, STIP and PNRS funds that can be utilized to deliver the I-10/Cherry and I-10/Citrus Interchange projects, and additional Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations.

Board Agenda Item
July 2, 2009
Page 3

Reviewed By: This item was reviewed and unanimously recommended for approval by the Plans and Programs Policy Committee on June 17, 2009.

Responsible Staff: Ty Schuiling, Director of Planning and Programming

ARRA TIGER Supplemental Discretionary Grant Program

Application Process:

- Applications Due: September 15, 2009
- Grants awarded: recipients will be selected ASAP, but no later than February 17, 2010.
- Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate the project's ability to meet Selection Criteria (Below) with most relevant information available, regardless of whether that information was specifically solicited – all such information will be considered part of the application, not supplemental.
- To be selected for a TIGER Discretionary Grant, a project must be an Eligible Project and the applicant must be an Eligible Applicant.

Contents of Application:

The narrative portion of applications should not exceed 25 pages

Applications should include:

General -

- name, phone number, email address, and organization address of the primary point of contact for the applicant
- certification that the applicant will comply with U.S.C. Federal Wage Rate Requirements
- information detailing whether the project will significantly impact the natural, social, and/or economic environment
- Completion of NEPA process (if applicable) or NEPA status
- information detailing whether the project is likely to require actions by other agencies (e.g. permits)

Project Details –

- detailed description of the proposed project
- geospatial data for the project
- description of how the project addresses the needs of an urban or rural area
- clear description of transportation challenges the project will address, and how it will do so

Applicant Details -

- information about the grant recipient and other project parties

Financial information –

- amount of grant funding requested
- other project funding
- total project costs
- percentage of project costs to be paid for with TIGER Discretionary Grant funds
- identity and percentage shares of all parties providing funds

Selection Criteria –

- information required for DOT to assess the project against Selection Criteria is outlined below

Grant Administration:

Each TIGER Discretionary Grant will be administered by the DOT modal administration with the most experience and/or expertise in the relevant project area

Solicitation for Comments:

Comments are due June 1, 2009. If comments result in adjustments, DOT will post a supplemental notice by June 17, 2009

Eligible Projects:

Includes, but not limited to:

- Title 23 eligible highway and bridge projects
- Public transportation projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, U.S.C.
- Passenger and freight rail projects
- Port infrastructure investment

Grants may be no more than \$300 million and no less than \$20 million – however, language provides for a waiver of minimum grant size

No more than 20% of the total \$1.5 billion can be spent in any one state

DOT will apply an initial ‘unconstrained competitive rating process’ to determine a preliminary list of projects – then evaluate that list to see if the projects meet the distributional requirements of the ARRA. If not, DOT will adjust the list of recommended projects to meet those requirements

Grants may be used for up to 100% of project costs

Eligible Applicants:

- State & Local governments
- Transit agencies
- Port authorities
- Other political subdivisions of State and local government
- Multi-State/Jurisdictional applicants

Guidance on Awarding Funds:

On March 20, 2009 POTUS released guidance for spending of ARRA funds. Grants shall be awarded “to projects with a demonstrated or potential ability to:

- (i) deliver programmatic results
- (ii) achieve economic stimulus by optimizing economic activity and the number of jobs created or saved in relation to the Federal dollars obligated
- (iii) achieve long-term public benefits
- (iv) satisfy the Recovery Act’s transparency and accountability objectives.”

DOT will not award funds to any project that is imprudent or does not further the job creation, economic recovery and other purposes of ARRA.

Selection Criteria & Guidance on Selection Criteria:

(i) **Primary Selection Criteria**

1. **Long Term Outcomes** – priority given to projects that have significant desirable, long-term outcomes for the Nation, a metro area, or a region
*****Applications that do not demonstrate a likelihood of significant long term benefits will NOT proceed in evaluation process*****

Applicants are generally required to submit a Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA). In the event DOT determines that the benefits are not likely to outweigh project costs, a grant will NOT be awarded.

- Applicants seeking a **waiver for the grant minimum** (\$20 million) are not required to submit a BCA
- Applicants seeking a **grant between \$20 million and \$100 million** must include estimates of the project’s expected benefits in the five (5) long term outcomes identified below **** *The lack of a useful analysis of expected benefits may be ground for denying grant application*****
- Applicants seeking a **grant of more than \$100 million** must provide a well-developed analysis of expected benefits and costs, including a description of input and output requirements and other methodological standards used for the analysis. Where relevant information is available, it should be included – where it is not available, an explanation of the data limitations should be included **** *The lack of a useful analysis of expected benefits may be ground for denying grant application*****

DOT encourages applicants to provide a plan for evaluating the success of their project and measuring short and long term performance

Priority will be given to the following long term benefits:

- **State of good repair** – improving the condition of existing infrastructure, particular emphasis on projects that minimize life-cycle costs

DOT will assess:

- whether a project is part of/consistent with relevant area plans to maintain infrastructure
- whether an important aim of the project is to rehabilitate, reconstruct or upgrade surface transportation projects whose poor condition threaten future economic growth
- whether the project is appropriately capitalized up front and uses asset management approaches that optimize its long term cost structure
- the extent to which a sustainable source of revenue is available for long term operations and management.

Applications should include:

- metrics concerning facility's current condition/performance AND projected condition/performance
 - explanation of how the project will improve condition/performance/long term cost structure
- **Economic competitiveness** – contributing to medium and long term US competitiveness

Applicant should not focus on SHORT Term benefits, which will be captured in the “Jobs Creation & Economic Stimulus” criterion

DOT will assess whether the project will contribute to growth in employment, production or other high value economic activity

DOT will consider the quality of jobs created, as well as whether those jobs are in Economically Distressed Areas

Priority will be given to projects that:

- Improve long term efficiency, reliability, or cost-competitiveness in the movement of workers or goods
 - Make improvements that allow for growth of private sector, particularly in Economically Distressed Areas.
- **Livability** – improving quality of work/life

Should include a description of the affected community and the size of the impact

DOT will assess whether the project:

- Enhances user mobility through more convenient transportation options
- Will improve existing transportation options

- Will improve access to transportation, goods and services for disadvantaged populations – non-drivers, disabled, lower incomes
- Is the result of a coordinated planning process involving community stakeholders

Includes bike and walking path improvements. Particular attention will be paid to projects that increase traveler mobility

- **Sustainability** – improving energy efficiency, reducing dependence on oil, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, benefiting the environment
- **Safety** – improving safety of facilities and systems

DOT will assess a project's ability to:

- Reduce the rate, number and consequences of crashes
- Reduce injuries and fatalities
- Eliminate highway/rail grade crossings
- Protect pipelines
- Prevent unintended release of hazardous materials

2. **Job Creation and Economic Stimulus** – priority given to projects that quickly create and preserve jobs and stimulate rapid increases in economic activity, *PARTICULARLY in economically distressed areas* Demonstration of a project's rapid economic impact is critical

DOT will assess:

- Whether the project will promote job opportunities for low-income workers
- Whether the project will provide maximum practicable opportunities for small and disadvantaged businesses
- Whether the project will make effective use of community-based organizations to connect disadvantaged workers with opportunities
- Whether the project will support entities that have a sound track record on labor practices and compliance with federal laws
- Whether the project implements best practices to ensure that all individuals benefit from ARRA

A key consideration will be how quickly a project can create jobs - DOT will assess:

- Project schedule
- Receipt of necessary environmental approvals
- Receipt of necessary legislative approvals
- Inclusion in State and local plans
- Technical Feasibility
- Financial Feasibility

DOT reserves the right to withdraw funds if not spent in a timely fashion – schedule for fund spend out will be determined on a project basis. Priority will be given to projects that can be completed by February 17, 2012

(ii) **Secondary Selection Criteria**

1. **Innovation** – priority given to projects that employ innovative strategies

DOT will assess the extent to which a project incorporates innovative technologies

2. **Partnership** – priority given to projects that demonstrate collaboration from large range of interests.

- **Jurisdictional and Stakeholder Collaboration** – DOT will assess the project's involvement of non-Federal entities and non-Federal funds
 - Priority will be given to projects that demonstrate collaboration with parties not typically involved in transportation projects
 - Priority will be given to projects that apply for TIGER Discretionary Grant funds as part of an overall funding package

DOT will assess the extent to which the project demonstrates collaboration with local and regional jurisdictions to achieve national, regional or metropolitan benefits

- Multiple States or jurisdictions can submit a joint application, but must designate a lead entity and demonstrate how the funds will be divided
- **Disciplinary Integration** – DOT will give priority to projects that are supported by non-transportation public agencies with similar objectives

Program-Specific Criteria:

To give determine priority between similar projects, DOT will use certain project-specific criteria

Program-specific criteria will only be used for the following types of projects:

- Bridge replacement projects – total daily truck and non-truck traffic, bridge sufficiency ratings, and bridges with load or geometric restriction
- Transit Projects – bus and rail fleet purchases within established FTA spare ratio policies, rehabilitation and replacement of assets that have exceeded the useful span as identified in FTA policy, and/or the proposed project's rating under the New Starts and Small Starts program criteria, as applicable
- Port Infrastructure Investments:

- Passenger and/or freight throughput, storage or processing capacity, including not limited to capacity movement across the dock, storage capacity on the terminal, and gate throughput
 - Demand for services or demand for capacity
 - Efficiency
 - Reliability and/or resiliency
 - National security or National interest aspects of items above, including but not limited to movement of Department of Defense assets and strategic location
 - External Factors that may influence or limit above items
- TIGER TIFIA Funds – program-specific criteria are the eight statutory selection criteria used by the Department’s TIFIA Joint Program Office to evaluate and select projects
 - Extent to which the project is nationally or regionally significant (20%)
 - Extent to which the project helps maintain or protect the environment (20%)
 - Extent to which TIFIA assistance would foster innovative public-private partnerships and attract private debt or equity investment (20%)
 - Creditworthiness of the project (12.5%)
 - Likelihood that TIFIA assistance would enable the project to proceed at an earlier date (12.5%)
 - Extent to which the project uses new technologies (5%)
 - Amount of budget authority required to fund the Federal credit instrument made available (5%)
 - Extent to which TIFIA assistance would reduce the contribution of Federal grant assistance to the project (5%)

TIFIA credit assistance requires receipt of a preliminary rating opinion letter indicating that the project’s senior debt obligations have the potential to attain an investment-grade rating.

Evaluation and Selection Process:

DOT will establish an evaluation team to review applications

Team will be lead by OST and will include technical and professional staff representatives from each of the modal departments

Selection Criteria – will be ranked using ‘highly recommended, recommended and not recommended’ evaluation

More weight will be given to the Primary Selection Criteria than the Secondary Selection Criteria

DOT supplied this table to explain how projects will be evaluated along the various criteria:

Long-Term Outcomes:	The Department will give more weight to this criterion than to either of the Secondary Selection Criteria. In addition, this criterion has a minimum threshold requirement. Projects that are unable to demonstrate a likelihood of significant long-term benefits in any of the five (5) long-term outcomes identified in this criterion will not proceed in the evaluation process.
Jobs Creation & Economic Stimulus	The Department will give more weight to this criterion than to either of the Secondary Selection Criteria. This criterion will be considered after it is determined that a project demonstrates a likelihood of significant long-term benefits in at least one of the five (5) long-term outcomes identified in the long-term outcomes criterion.
Innovation & Partnership	The Department will give less weight to these criteria than to the Primary Selection Criteria.
Project-Specific Criteria	The Department will only give weight to these criteria to the extent the Department needs to differentiate multiple similar projects that are rated similarly based on the Primary and Secondary Selection Criteria.

TIGER TIFIA Payments:

Applicants should apply in accordance with a criteria and guidance above and will be evaluated concurrently with other projects

Applicants seeking TIFIA TIGER Payment are required to comply with all of the standard TIFIA application and approval requirements

INCLUDING the submission of a Letter of Interest due six (6) weeks prior to the Application Deadline

Project Benefits:

DOT expects to report on the benefits of projects awarded TIGER Discretionary Grants

Recipients will be expected to cooperate with DOT efforts to collect information related to project benefits

Reporting Requirements:

TIGER Discretionary Grant recipients will be required to report on grant activities on a regular basis

Certification Requirements:

Certification requirements include:

- Maintenance of Effort
- Transparency and Oversight
- Additional Funding Distribution and Assurance of Appropriate Use of Funds

Recommended SANBAG Candidate Projects for TIGER Discretionary Program Funding

Projects recommended by SANBAG Staff to be submitted along with other projects from the Southern California Corridor Consensus Group TIGER Discretionary Program Applications are:

- I-10 Ramps widening and Auxiliary Lane project at Cherry, Citrus and Cedar Ave Interchange.

Project Benefits:

The interchange ramp and auxiliary lane improvements will reduce congestion and improve travel times for goods movement, commuters from much of the San Bernardino Valley, and regional recreational traffic by easing mainline freeway congestion associated with traffic queuing onto the mainline and from weaving conflicts. Inadequate stacking capacity on interchange ramps intermittently causes queues onto mainline lanes, particularly in areas of heavy truck volumes associated with interregional freight movement and warehousing. The proposed interchange improvements are anticipated to reduce the overall number of accidents by increasing storage capacity of the exit ramps. During peak hours traffic extends onto the mainline. The improvement will also complement interchange reconstruction projects at Cherry, Citrus, Cedar and Riverside Ave.

Project Cost and Schedule:

The proposed project cost is estimated at \$32.7 million. Construction is scheduled to begin in December 2009. TIGER Discretionary Program request: \$4 million

- I-10 Mixed flow lane westbound from Ford St to west of Live Oak Canyon Rd.

Project Benefits:

This project will improve mobility from the growing Coachella Valley and Banning Pass areas to Greater Los Angeles, as well as locally for Yucaipa and Redlands residents within the San Bernardino/Riverside Urbanized Area. It removes a significant capacity deficiency for westbound commuter, commercial, and recreational trips on the only reasonably available link between these areas. The project addresses a portion of a three-lane westbound segment situated between a four-lane westbound section further east in Riverside County, and a four-lane section further west in Redlands. The project will relieve congestion-related accidents by reducing current and future congestion; facilitating weaving, merging, and diverging movements at interchange ramps; and providing greater separation between trucks and light-duty vehicles.

Project Cost and Schedule:

The proposed project cost is estimated at \$43.1 million. Construction is scheduled to begin in January 2010. TIGER Discretionary Program request: \$10 million

- Hunts Lane at Union Pacific (UPRR) Grade Separation

Project Benefits:

This project is located along the Alameda Corridor East on the Yuma rail line serving the Union Pacific Railroad at Hunts Lane in the City of San Bernardino and City of Colton. Constructing a multi-span, grade-separation bridge will eliminate existing and future traffic congestion and delays on Hunts Lane caused by rail traffic on the UPRR Lines. The project will increase travel reliability on major roadways for both the community and truck traffic, improve air quality, and eliminate potential conflict between vehicular and train traffic.

Project Cost and Schedule:

The proposed project cost is estimated at \$29 million. Construction is scheduled to begin in March 2010. TIGER Discretionary Program request: \$10 million

- Monte Vista Ave at Union Pacific and Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF) Grade Separation

Project Benefits:

This project is located along the Alameda Corridor East on UPRR and BNSF Railroad at Monte Vista Ave in the City of Montclair. Constructing a multi-span, grade-separation bridge over the railroad tracks will eliminate existing and future traffic congestion and delays on Monte Vista Ave caused by rail traffic on the UPRR Lines. The project will increase travel reliability on major roadways for both the community and truck traffic, improve air quality and eliminate potential conflict between vehicular and train traffic.

Project Cost and Schedule:

The proposed project cost is estimated at \$28 million. Construction is scheduled to begin in July 2010. TIGER Discretionary Program request: \$11.8 million

Total TIGER Discretionary Program request: \$35.8 Million

AGENCY REPORTS



-
- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
 - San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
-

JUNE COMMUTER RAIL REPORT

1. PATRONAGE

San Bernardino Line:

Patronage on the San Bernardino Line decreased 3% compared to last month and was down 8% from the same month last year. Preliminary June data is slightly higher than May with a current average of 12,568 passenger trips per weekday.

San Bernardino Line Saturday patronage was less than 1% higher than last month but 8% lower than May 2008. June data-to-date shows even lower ridership than May, currently at 3,397 passenger trips per Saturday.

Sunday ridership showed a 10% increase from last month but an almost 3% decrease from the same month a year ago. As of mid-June, average Sunday ridership is down from May with a currently average of 2,245 passenger trips per Sunday.

Riverside-Ontario-Los Angeles Line:

May average daily ridership on the Riverside Line decreased almost 4% from last month and dropped 7% in a year-to-year comparison. A preview look at June data shows a 5% increase in patronage with a current average of 5,258 passenger trips per weekday.

Inland Empire-Orange County (IEOC) Line:

Ridership on the IEOC Line dropped almost 5% from last month and was also down 15% from the same month last year. At this point, June ridership is down from May with the current daily average at 4,037 passenger trips per weekday.

Total System:

System wide, average daily ridership decreased 2% from April 2009. May 2009 was 8% slower than May 2008. Early data for June suggests a slight (<1%) bump in patronage with a current average of 42,095 passenger trips per weekday.

Table 1

Average Weekday Daily Ridership*

	<u>San Bernardino</u>	<u>Riverside</u>	<u>IEOC</u>	<u>Systemwide</u>
May 2009	12,453	4,996	4,226	41,803
May 2008	13,533	5,389	4,970	45,443
% Change	- 8.0%	- 7.3%	- 15.0%	- 8.0%

* Adjusted for Holidays

Table 2

Average Weekend Ridership

	<u>San Bernardino Saturday</u>	<u>San Bernardino Sunday</u>
May 2009	3,621	2,592
May 2008	3,946	2,658
% Change	- 8.2%	- 2.5%

2. ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (arrival within 5 minutes of scheduled time)

San Bernardino Line:

May on-time performance for the San Bernardino Line worsened in comparison to April. While inbound trains held steady at 93% on time, outbound trains dropped from 95% on time in April to 90% on time in May. Mechanical difficulties caused forty percent of the sixty-nine reported delays.

Riverside-Ontario-Los Angeles Line:

On-time performance for the Riverside Line also worsened from April to May. Again, inbound trains held steady, but outbound trains dropped four percentage points, from 99% on time in April to 95% on time in May. Four of the seven reported delays were due to regulatory issues.

Inland Empire-Orange County (IEOC) Line:

May on-time performance for the IEOC Line improved compared to April and represented the best performance for this line in over a year. Both southbound and northbound trains gained two percentage points to each finish May on time 99% of the time. Metrolink operations and mechanical difficulties each accounted for two of the seven reported delays.

Table 3

On Time Performance

**% of weekday trains arriving w/in 5 min of scheduled time
(May 2009 vs. May 2008)**

	<u>San Bernardino</u>		<u>Riverside</u>		<u>IEOC</u>	
	In	Out	In	Out	So	No
May 2009	93%	90%	99%	95%	99%	99%
May 2008	98%	96%	98%	99%	95%	95%



South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178
(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

June 9, 2009

Members of the Governing Board:

Chairman

Dr. William A. Burke
Speaker of the Assembly
Appointee

Vice Chairman

S. Roy Wilson, Ed.D.
Chairman of the Board
County of Riverside

Michael D. Antonovich
Supervisor, Fifth District
County of Los Angeles

Michael A. Cacciotti
Councilmember, City of South Pasadena
Cities of Los Angeles County/
Eastern Region

Bill Campbell
Supervisor, Third District
County of Orange

Jane W. Carney
Senate Rules Appointee

Ronald O. Loveridge
Mayor, Riverside
Cities of Riverside County

Joseph K. Lyou, Ph.D.
Governor's Appointee

Josie Gonzales
Supervisor, Fifth District
County of San Bernardino

Jan Perry
Councilmember, 9th District
City of Los Angeles Representative

Miguel A. Pulido
Mayor, Santa Ana
Cities of Orange County

Tonia Reyes Uranga
Councilmember, City of Long Beach
Cities of Los Angeles County/
Western Region

Dennis R. Yates
Mayor, Chino
Cities of San Bernardino County

To: Mayors and Councilmembers

From: Dennis R. Yates, Mayor/City of Chino
Cities of San Bernardino County
Board Member, South Coast AQMD

Dennis R. Yates
dc

Attached are the agenda items and the outcome of the June 5, 2009 AQMD Governing Board meeting, and a preview of the items for discussion at the July 10, 2009, meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS AT THE JUNE 5, 2009 BOARD MEETING

Adopt Executive Officer's FY 2009-10 AQMD Budget and Work Program

The Executive Officer's Budget for FY 2009-10 represents the input over the past several months from Board members, staff, and the public. This year's process included meetings from the Budget Advisory Committee; a public hearing on February 6, 2009 to receive input on the AQMD's Program Goals and Objectives; and two budget workshops, one for the public held on April 29 and one for the Board held on May 14-15, 2009. This submittal transmits the required appropriations and reserves necessary to adopt the proposed budget. (Administrative Committee, May 8, 2009)

Majority Votes: 13 Yes, 0 No, 0 Absent

Amend Regulation III – Fees

Staff is proposing a limited number of amendments to Regulation III – Fees to better align program revenues with program costs. Other proposed amendments clarify rule provisions and have minor fee adjustments. Staff is also proposing administrative amendments that have no revenue impact. Staff is not proposing a CPI increase for this fiscal year. (Review: Stationary Source Committee, April 17, 2009 and Administrative Committee, May 8, 2009)

Majority Votes: 13 Yes, 0 No, 0 Absent

Amend Rule 317 – Clean Air Act Non-Attainment Fees

(This item has been continued to the July 20, 2009 Board meeting)

The public hearing for the proposed amended rule was continued to the June Board meeting. The newly proposed amendments incorporate provisions for an alternative baseline for calculating fees and an exemption for permit units at BACT as requested by the Board at the April 2009 public hearing. (Review: Stationary Source Committee, January 23, 2009 and March 20, 2009)

Majority Votes: Yes, No, Absent

Adopt Proposed Rule 433 – Natural Gas Quality

Fluctuations in natural gas quality may adversely impact emissions from natural gas-powered equipment. The objective of Proposed Rule 433 is to monitor the quality of natural gas being supplied to end users located within the AQMD and determine the effects of liquefied natural gas additions on the natural gas distribution system. (Review: Stationary Source Committee, April 17, 2009)

Majority Votes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 2 Absent

Amend Rule 1401 – New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants to Add Cancer Risk Value for Ethyl Benzene

The proposal would add a cancer risk value for ethyl benzene to the list of toxic air contaminants (TACs) in Rule 1401 – New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants. The cancer risk value was approved by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment in November 2007. In addition to impacts for new, modified, and relocated equipment subject to Rule 1401, a preliminary assessment of impacts for existing facilities subject to 1401 – Control of Toxic Air Contaminants from Existing Sources is included because Rule 1402 uses the same list of TACs. (Review: Stationary Source Committee, April 17, 2009)

Majority Votes: 12 Yes, 0 No, 1 Absent

There is no Board meeting scheduled in August.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SET FOR SEPTEMBER 11, 2009 BOARD MEETING

Amend Rule 1145 – Plastic, Rubber, Leather and Glass Coatings

The proposed amendment would, in part, implement control measure MCS-07 – Application of All Feasible Measures of the 2007 AQMP by aligning the current VOC limit for the multi-colored category with the VOC limit recommended in U.S. EPA Control Techniques Guidelines. A new coating category is recommended for addition to the table of standards for coating glass panels used in refrigerated commercial glass door assemblies. Other minor clarifications and corrections (e.g., numbering) are also proposed. (Review: Stationary Source Committee, July 24, 2009)



REPORT: Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee

FROM: Gwenn Norton-Perry, SANBAG Representative to the MSRC

SYNOPSIS: Below is a summary of key issues addressed at the MSRC's special meeting on May 21, 2009. The MSRC's next regularly scheduled meeting is June 18, 2009, at 2:00 p.m. in Conference Room CC8.

MSRC's Annual Offsite Retreat with its Technical Advisory Committee

The MSRC conducted its annual joint offsite retreat with its Technical Advisory Committee on Thursday, May 21, 2009, at the City of Temecula. The MSRC's Outreach Coordinator, The Better World Group, provided a detailed update on regulatory and legislative issues of the day affecting the MSRC's goals and future work programs, including the economic and budget crisis, implementation of AB 32 and SB 375, ARB activities including the ZEV Program, other key legislative bills (e.g., AB 231, AB 1212, SB 632, AB 118, etc.), and recent emphasis on black carbon. CARB provided a brief update on its priorities, namely PM_{2.5} and NO_x reductions as well as development of blackbox measures and off-road engine cleanup. A presentation on air quality and AQMD priorities from criteria pollutants to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions was also given. The MSRC's Technical Advisor reviewed the MSRC's progress and gave an overview on technology changes during the last 20 years. He noted that the MSRC's current Local Government Match Program is already oversubscribed by a factor of two and there remains a continued need for alternative fuel school bus incentives. Finally, he noted interest in programs for trip reduction strategies, partnership opportunities to apply resources to more quickly reach the region's goals, and EV charging infrastructure. Discussions on options on how to allocate FY 2009-10 Work Program dollars will be considered by the MSRC at its next meeting. The MSRC and its Technical Advisory Committee along with MSRC staff also went on a tour of the nearby Downs L/CNG fueling station, which was partially funded by both the MSRC and AQMD.

Re-Election of MSRC Chair & Vice-Chair

Annually the MSRC elects its chair and vice-chair. At its May 21, 2009 meeting, the MSRC re-elected its chair and vice-chair for another one-year term. Temecula Council

Member Ron Roberts, representing SCAG, was re-elected as the chair, and Mr. Greg Winterbottom, representing OCTA, was re-elected as the vice-chair. This is the second term for both.

Received and Approved Final Reports

The MSRC received and approved two final reports at its May 21, 2009 meeting, as follows:

1. Orange County Transportation Authority Contract #MS07009, which provided \$800,000 towards the purchase of 40 transit buses; and
2. CR&R Inc. Contract #MS04039, which provided \$463,168 towards the purchase of 30 CNG refuse trucks.

All final reports are filed in the AQMD's library and a two-page summary of each closed project can be viewed in the electronic library on the MSRC's website at <http://www.cleantransportationfunding.org>.

Contract Modification Requests

At its May 21, 2009 meeting, the MSRC considered six contract modification requests and took unanimous action, as follows:

1. For City of Beaumont Contract #ML05027, which provides \$20,000 towards the purchase of a heavy-duty CNG bus, approval of one-year term extension;
2. For County of Los Angeles, Dept. of Public Works Contract #ML05013, which provides \$313,000 for a Santa Clarita Valley traffic signal synchronization project, approval of a one-year term extension;
3. For Burrtec Waste Industries Contract #MS08005, which provides \$450,000 towards the purchase of 15 heavy-duty natural gas vehicles, approval to modify vehicle deployment locations;
4. For Burrtec Waste Industries Contract #MS08006, which provides \$450,000 towards the purchase of 15 heavy-duty natural gas vehicles, approval to modify vehicle deployment locations;
5. For Atlantic Express Contract #PT05064, which provides \$67,500 for diesel exhaust aftertreatment retrofit devices, approval of a six-month term extension; and
6. For City of South Pasadena Contract #ML06064, which provides \$75,000 towards the purchase of three heavy-duty CNG vehicles, approval of a one-year term extension, vehicle substitution, and a reduction in value and scope.

Contracts Administrator's Report

The MSRC's AB 2766 Contracts Administrator provides a written status report on all open contracts from FY 2002-03 through the present.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

APPOINTING/ELECTING AUTHORITY	REGIONAL COUNCIL (12:00 noon)	POLICY COMMITTEES (RC Members Serve on One Each) (Subregional Appointments) (County Commissions Appoint One to TCC) (10:00 a.m.)		
		Community, Economic, and Human Development	Energy and Environment	Transportation and Communications
District 6 (Grand Terrace, Colton, Loma Linda, Redlands, Yucaipa)	P. Gilbreath			P. Gilbreath
District 7 (San Bernardino, Highland)	L. McCallon	L. McCallon		
District 8 (Rialto, Fontana)	D. Robertson	D. Robertson		
District 9 (Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, Montclair)	P. Eaton		P. Eaton	
District 10 (Chino, Chino Hills, Ontario)	G. Duncan			G. Duncan
District 11 (Barstow, Big Bear, Needles, Twentynine Palms, Yucca Valley)	B. Jahn	B. Jahn		
District 65 (Adelanto, Apple Valley, Hesperia, Victorville)	G. Coleman			
San Bernardino County	G. Ovitt			G. Ovitt
SANBAG Acting as County Transportation Commission	K. Chastain			K. Chastain
SANBAG Subregional Appointees*		B. Cortes G. Norton-Perry Vacant (J. Mitchell)	Vacant (J. Harrison) E. Scott	Vacant (P. Leon) J. Pomierski

*One appointee to each policy committee for a total of three appointees per subregion, plus one additional appointee for every SCAG District over three in the subregion. SANBAG has a total of seven subregional appointees to the policy committees.

Rules of Appointment

1. SANBAG policy stipulates that all SANBAG appointees be SANBAG Board Members.
2. SCAG President appoints Regional Council members to Standing and Policy Committees.

Terms of Appointment

Terms of appointment for Regional Council members representing odd numbered districts expire immediately following the SCAG General Assembly in April of odd numbered years. Terms of appointment for Regional Council members representing even numbered districts expire immediately following the SCAG General Assembly in May of even numbered years. SANBAG appointments to SCAG Policy Committees are for a term from May through the next regular SCAG general assembly of the following year.

Stipend

SCAG provides Regional Council members \$100 per day for a maximum of four meetings per month, plus mileage. A stipend for the fifth meeting per month may be received on approval by SCAG's Executive Director. SCAG also provides subregional appointees representing SANBAG on SCAG Policy Committees \$70 per meeting.

Meeting Information

The regular meetings of SCAG Regional Council, Standing Committees, and Policy Committees are on the first Thursday of each month at the SCAG Offices located at 818 W. Seventh Street, Los Angeles:

10:00 a.m., Policy Committees 12:00 noon, Regional Council

Policy Committees

Community, Economic, and Human Development: Provides policy recommendations to the Regional Council on subjects of housing, land use, resource, economic, community development, infrastructure, employment, and regional disaster preparedness issues. Reviews and recommends to the Planning Committee revisions to the Housing, Economy, Growth Management, Human Resources, and Finance Chapters of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide.

Energy and Environment: Acts as the policy advisory committee to the Regional Council on environmental issues, including air and water, hazardous, solid waste management, natural resources conservation, and energy conservation. Reviews the Environmental Impact Report of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. Provides recommendations to the Planning Committee on state and federal legislative proposals and administrative guidelines affecting environmental quality, resource conservation, **Transportation and Communications:** Acts as the policy advisory committee to the Regional Council on all regional matters pertaining to the movement of goods and people on land, water, and air. Reviews and recommends to the Regional Council all major utility development plans. Addresses the location, size, or capacity, timing, and impact of facilities.

SANBAG Policy Committee Membership

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP	TERMS
Administrative Committee SANBAG President, Vice President, and Immediate Past President 3 East Valley (2 City, 1 County) 3 West Valley (2 City, 1 County) 3 Mt/Desert (2 City, 1 County) City members shall be SANBAG Board Members elected by caucus of city SANBAG Board Members within the subarea. Supervisors collectively select their representatives. The SANBAG Vice President shall serve as Chair of the Administrative Committee.	Makes recommendations to Board of Directors and: (1) Provides general policy oversight which spans the multiple program responsibilities of the organization and maintains the comprehensive organization integrity; (2) Provides policy direction with respect to administrative issues, policies, budget, finance, audit, and personnel issues for the organization; (3) Serves as policy review committee for any program area that lacks active policy committee oversight. Committee has authority to approve contracts of up to \$25,000 with Board of Directors ratification to follow.	Brad Mitzelfelt, Supervisor, Vice President (Chair) Paul Eaton, Montclair, President (Vice Chair) Gary Ovitt, Supervisor, Past President Paul Biane, Supervisor Pat Gilbreath, Grand Terrace Josie Gonzales, Supervisor Mike Leonard, Hesperia Brad Mitzelfelt, Supervisor Pat Morris, San Bernardino Gwenn Norton-Perry, Chino Hills Rick Roelle, Apple Valley Dennis Yates, Chino	6/30/2010 6/30/2010 6/30/2010 12/31/2009 12/31/2010 12/31/2009 12/31/2010 12/31/2009 12/31/2009 12/31/2009 12/31/2009 12/31/2010
Commuter Rail Committee Nine Valley-elected officials, four of who shall be the Southern California Regional Rail Authority primary (*) and alternate (**) members. The terms of appointments for SCRRRA members and alternates shall be concurrent with their term on SCRRRA. The four remaining members shall be SANBAG Board Members appointed by the SANBAG President for two-year terms.	Provides policy guidance and recommendations to the SANBAG Board of Directors and Southern California Regional Rail Authority delegates with respect to commuter rail service in San Bernardino County. * SCRRRA Primary Member ** SCRRRA Alternate Member	Pat Gilbreath, Redlands** (Chair) Paul Eaton, Montclair* (Vice Chair) Kelly Chastain, Colton Bea Cortes, Grand Terrace Neil Derry, Supervisor Larry McCallon, Highland Pat Morris, San Bernardino* John Pomierski, Upland Diane Williams, Rancho Cucamonga**	Indeterminate (6/30/2009) Indeterminate (6/30/2009) 12/31/2009 12/31/2010 12/31/2010 12/31/2010 Indeterminate 12/31/2009 Indeterminate
Mountain/Desert Committee Membership consists of SANBAG Board Members from each Mountain/Desert jurisdiction and County Supervisors representing the First and Third Districts.	Provides ongoing policy level oversight related to the full array of SANBAG responsibilities as they pertain specifically to the Mountain/Desert subregion. The Committee also meets as the Mountain/Desert Measure I Committee as it carries out responsibilities for Measure I Mountain/Desert Expenditure Plan.	Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake (Chair) Mike Leonard, Hesperia (Vice Chair) Neil Derry, Supervisor Jim Harris, Twentynine Palms Ryan McEachron, Victorville Julie McIntyre, Barstow Brad Mitzelfelt, Supervisor William Neeb, Yucca Valley Trinidad Perez, Adelanto Rick Roelle, Apple Valley Jeff Williams, Needles	Indeterminate (6/30/2010) Indeterminate (6/30/2010) Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate Indeterminate

SANBAG Policy Committee Membership

[illegible]

Policy Committee Meeting Times

Administrative Committee

Commuter Rail Committee

Major Projects Committee

Mountain/Desert Committee

Plans & Programs Committee

Second Wednesday 9:00 a.m.: SANBAG Offices

Third Thursday every other month following the SANBAG Board meeting (Odd Months), 12:00 noon, SANBAG Offices

Second Thursday following the SANBAG Board meeting, 9:00 a.m., SANBAG Offices

Third Friday 9:00 a.m. Apple Valley

Third Friday, 9:00 a.m., Apple Valley
Third Wednesday 12:00 noon SANBAG Offices.

SANBAG Policy Committee Membership

SANBAG Ad Hoc Committees

COMMITTEE	PURPOSE	MEMBERSHIP
<p>Audit Subcommittee of the Administrative Committee In November 2008, the Board approved the creation of an Audit Subcommittee of the Administrative Committee to strengthen the financial oversight function of the Board.</p> <p>Additional SANBAG Board Members may be appointed annually at the discretion of the Board President.</p>	<p>The responsibilities of the Audit Subcommittee shall be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a direct contact between the independent auditor and the Board of Directors before, during and after the annual audit. • Work with the auditor and SANBAG staff on reviewing and implementing practices and controls identified in the annual audit. 	<p>Audit Subcommittee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SANBAG President – Gary Ovitt, Supervisor - Vice President – Paul Eaton, Montclair - Immediate Past President – Vacant - Presidential Appointment – Pat Gilbreath, Redlands
<p>Ad Hoc Committee to Review Council of Government Roles In June 2006, the SANBAG President appointed the committee.</p>	<p>Reviews SANBAG activities and Board Member requests related to SANBAG's role as a Council of Governments.</p>	<p>Kelly Chastain, Colton (Chair)</p> <p>Dennis Hansberger, SBCO, representing East Valley and Mountain/Desert</p> <p>Josie Gonzales, SBCO, representing the East Valley</p> <p>John Pomierski, Upland, representing West Valley and recognizing his position as Major Projects Committee Chair</p> <p>Pat Morris, San Bernardino, representing the East Valley</p> <p>Paul Eaton, Montclair, representing the West Valley and recognizing his position as Plans & Programs Committee Chair</p> <p>Vacant - Jim Lindley, Hesperia, representing Mountain/Desert and recognizing his position as Mountain/Desert Committee Vice Chair.</p>
<p>Ad Hoc Committee on Litigation with San Bernardino County Flood Control District In January 2007, the SANBAG President was authorized to appoint an ad hoc review committee of SANBAG Board Members who do not represent local jurisdictions party to the San Bernardino County Flood Control District vs. SANBAG litigation relative to the Colonies Development.</p> <p>In April 2008, the role of this committee was expanded to include the Cactus Basin litigation.</p>	<p>Reviews and provides guidance on litigation with San Bernardino County Flood Control District regarding the Colonies Development and the Cactus Basin in Rialto.</p>	<p>Pat Morris, San Bernardino, Chair</p> <p>Mark Nuaimi, Fontana</p> <p>Pat Gilbreath, Redlands</p> <p>Richard Riddell, Yucaipa</p> <p>Larry McCallon, Highland</p>

This list provides information on acronyms commonly used by transportation planning professionals. This information is provided in an effort to assist SANBAG Board Members and partners as they participate in deliberations at SANBAG Board meetings. While a complete list of all acronyms which may arise at any given time is not possible, this list attempts to provide the most commonly-used terms. SANBAG staff makes every effort to minimize use of acronyms to ensure good communication and understanding of complex transportation processes.

AB	Assembly Bill
ACE	Alameda Corridor East
ACT	Association for Commuter Transportation
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
APTA	American Public Transportation Association
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
ATMIS	Advanced Transportation Management Information Systems
BAT	Barstow Area Transit
CALACT	California Association for Coordination Transportation
CALCOG	California Association of Councils of Governments
CALSAFE	California Committee for Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
CMIA	Corridor Mobility Improvement Account
CMP	Congestion Management Program
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
COG	Council of Governments
CSAC	California State Association of Counties
CTA	California Transit Association
CTC	California Transportation Commission
CTC	County Transportation Commission
CTP	Comprehensive Transportation Plan
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise
DEMO	Federal Demonstration Funds
DOT	Department of Transportation
EA	Environmental Assessment
E&D	Elderly and Disabled
E&H	Elderly and Handicapped
EIR	Environmental Impact Report (California)
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement (Federal)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FSP	Freeway Service Patrol
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FTIP	Federal Transportation Improvement Program
GFOA	Government Finance Officers Association
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HOV	High-Occupancy Vehicle
ICTC	Interstate Clean Transportation Corridor
IEEP	Inland Empire Economic Partnership
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
IIP/ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
IVDA	Inland Valley Development Agency
JARC	Job Access Reverse Commute
LACMTA	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
LTF	Local Transportation Funds
MAGLEV	Magnetic Levitation

MARTA	Mountain Area Regional Transportation Authority
MBTA	Morongo Basin Transit Authority
MDAB	Mojave Desert Air Basin
MDAQMD	Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSRC	Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee
NAT	Needles Area Transit
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
OA	Obligation Authority
OCTA	Orange County Transportation Authority
PA&ED	Project Approval and Environmental Document
PASTACC	Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council
PDT	Project Development Team
PNRS	Projects of National and Regional Significance
PPM	Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds
PSE	Plans, Specifications and Estimates
PSR	Project Study Report
PTA	Public Transportation Account
PTC	Positive Train Control
PTMISEA	Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account
PUC	Public Utilities Commission
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RDA	Redevelopment Agency
RFP	Request for Proposal
RIP	Regional Improvement Program
RSTIS	Regionally Significant Transportation Investment Study
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
SB	Senate Bill
SAFE	Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
SAFETEA-LU	Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCRRA	Southern California Regional Rail Authority
SHA	State Highway Account
SHOPP	State Highway Operations and Protection Program
SOV	Single-Occupant Vehicle
S RTP	Short Range Transit Plan
STAF	State Transit Assistance Funds
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
STP	Surface Transportation Program
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TCIF	Trade Corridor Improvement Fund
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TCRP	Traffic Congestion Relief Program
TDA	Transportation Development Act
TEA	Transportation Enhancement Activities
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century
TMC	Transportation Management Center
TMEE	Traffic Management and Environmental Enhancement
TSM	Transportation Systems Management
TSSDRA	Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response Account
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VCTC	Ventura County Transportation Commission
VVTA	Victor Valley Transit Authority
WRCOG	Western Riverside Council of Governments

San Bernardino Associated Governments



MISSION STATEMENT

To enhance the quality of life for all residents, San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) will:

- Improve cooperative regional planning
- Develop an accessible, efficient, multi-modal transportation system
- Strengthen economic development efforts
- Exert leadership in creative problem solving

To successfully accomplish this mission, SANBAG will foster enhanced relationships among all of its stakeholders while adding to the value of local governments.

Approved June 2, 1993
Reaffirmed March 6, 1996